

HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO

“... before you could say ‘Pip-pip’” – translating Wodehousian interjections

A study of three Finnish Wodehouse
translations by Kaisa Sivenius

Ville Toivonen
Master's Thesis
English Translation
Faculty of Arts
University of Helsinki
March 2018

Tiedekunta/Osasto – Fakultet/Sektion – Faculty Humanistinen tiedekunta		Laitos – Institution – Department	
Tekijä – Författare – Author Ville Toivonen			
Työn nimi – Arbetets titel – Title “... before you could say ‘Pip-pip’” - translating Wodehousian interjections. A study of three Finnish Wodehouse translations by Kaisa Sivenius.			
Oppiaine – Läroämne – Subject Englannin kääntäminen			
Työn laji – Arbetets art – Level Pro gradu -tutkielma		Aika – Datum – Month and year 03/2018	Sivumäärä– Sidoantal – Number of pages 60 s. + suomenkielinen lyhennelmä 14s.
<p>Tiivistelmä – Referat – Abstract</p> <p>Tutkielmassani tutkin, miten Kaisa Siveniuksen kolmessa Wodehouse-käännöksessä on käännetty P.G. Wodehousille tyypillisiä interjektioita ja millaisia seurauksia käännösstrategioiden valinnoilla on. Ensimmäinen kysymys viittaa siihen, minkälaisia käännösstrategioita interjektioiden kääntämiseen on valittu ja kuinka johdonmukaisesti kääntäjä on käyttänyt vastineitaan. Toinen kysymys puolestaan tutkii sitä, miten käännökset ovat vaikuttaneet interjektioiden tyyppikategorioihin ja funktioihin. Tutkimukseni on sekä kvantitatiivista että kvalitatiivista.</p> <p>Tutkielmassani interjektioilla viitataan kielen piiriin kuuluvaan, lauseen kaltaisesti käyttäytyvään huudahdukseen, jolla voidaan ilmaista niin tunnetiloja, tiedostamista, halua, sosiaalisen kanssakäymisen edesauttamista, onomatopoeettisuutta, diskurssin vuorojakaumaa kuin puhujan asennoitumista toisen puhujan antamaan informaatioon ja tekoihin. Kokosin kyseinen määritelmän monesta eri lähteestä konsensuksen puuttuessa. Tyyppikategorioilla viitataan Amekan interjektioiden jakotapaan, jonka mukaan interjektiot ovat jaettavissa kolmeen eri luokkaan semanttisten ja morfologisten piirteidensä mukaan. Interjektion funktioilla viitataan niihin eri asioihin, joita interjektioilla voidaan ilmaista. Lisäksi määrittelen Wodehousille tyypilliset interjektiot Wodehouse-tutkijoiden, kuten Hall Jr.:n ja Usbornen, kirjoitusten pohjalta.</p> <p>Tutkielmani aineistona käytän kolmea P.G. Wodehousen romaania sekä Kaisa Siveniuksen vastaavaa kolmea käännöstä. Romaanit ovat <i>Right Ho, Jeeves</i> (1934), <i>The Code of the Woosters</i> (1938) ja <i>Joy in the Morning</i> (1946). Niiden vastaavat käännökset on julkaistu kokoelmateoksissa <i>Kiitos, Jeeves</i> (2009) ja <i>Hiiop, Jeeves</i> (2010). Interjektioiden kielitieteellisessä osiossa nojaan ennen kaikkea Cuencan, Amekan ja Wilkinsin teorioihin, sekä analyysiosiossa sovellan Cuencan kuusipolvista, interjektioiden kääntämiseen tarkoitettua mallia, joka on alun perin suunniteltu audiovisuaaliseen kääntämiseen.</p> <p>Analyysistä selviää, että kääntäjä on pääosin kääntänyt interjektioita kirjaimellisesti, käyttämällä erimuotoisia mutta samamerkityksisiä interjektioita tai käyttämällä erimerkityksisiä interjektioita. Lisäksi kääntäjä on selkeästi pyrkinyt säilyttämään interjektioiden tarkoituksen ja funktion eikä niinkään niiden muodollisia piirteitä. Tutkielma myös todistaa sen, että Cuencan malli sopii hyvin myös kirjallisuuden kääntämisen tutkimukseen.</p>			
Avainsanat – Nyckelord – Keywords interjektio, Wodehouse, kirjallisuuden kääntäminen			
Säilytyspaikka – Förvaringställe – Where deposited Keskustakampuksen kirjasto			
Muita tietoja – Övriga uppgifter – Additional information			

Table of contents

1 “To start things off with a tentative ‘What ho...’” - The Introduction.....	1
2 “I ventured to interject.” - The Theory.....	4
2.1 Interjections.....	4
2.1.1 Primary, secondary, and complex interjections.....	8
2.1.2 Interjections classified according to function.....	11
2.1.3 Translating interjections.....	14
2.2 Wodehouse’s style in relation to interjections.....	17
3 “You know my methods, Jeeves. Apply them.” - The Material and Methods.....	20
4 “Like Jeeves, Wodehouse stands alone, and analysis is useless.” - The Analysis..	22
4.1 Exclamations in the source texts.....	22
4.2 Translation strategies.....	28
4.2.1 Literal translation.....	29
4.2.2 Translation by using an interjection with dissimilar form but the same meaning.....	30
4.2.3 Translation by using a non-interjective structure with similar meaning....	31
4.2.4 Translation by using an interjection with a different meaning.....	33
4.2.5 Omission.....	36
4.2.6 Addition of elements.....	37
4.3 Changes in category and function.....	39
4.3.1 Categorical changes.....	39
4.3.2 Functional changes.....	44
5 “‘You see the posish, Jeeves,’ I concluded.” - The Conclusions.....	56
6 Bibliography.....	58
7 Lyhennelmä.....	I

1 “To start things off with a tentative ‘What ho...’”¹ - The Introduction

In this thesis, I’m going to delve into the mysterious yet inconspicuous world of interjections, and what implications different translation strategies of such seemingly negligible linguistic items can have on a text. According to Ameka (1992a: 101), interjections have managed to avoid an overall definition and have been largely ignored in linguistic discourse. He further adds that “they are thought of as peripheral to the main sound system and linguists for a long time were not concerned with peripheral elements,” (1992a: 116) while Cuenca (2000: 29), upon studying the topic by and large, has come to the conclusion that “they are held to be a ‘peculiar’ grammatical class.” More recent sources confirm that such shunning still seems to be fashionable, like Taavitsainen *et al.* (2014: 117), who maintain that interjections have been downright ostracised in some grammars. Fortunately there are researchers, like the ones mentioned above, who have blazed the trail and essayed to show the academic world how marked effects such elements can have on a text. However, the sad fact remains that even though more and more researchers have felt the need to elucidate the status and potential of interjections, there still doesn’t seem to be a prevailing consensus on the issue of what interjection really are. It is unclear what is the correct class that should be assigned to them, and it is equally unclear how to classify them, or even what to call interjections in the first place.

Meanwhile, there’s another topic which has been conspicuous by its absence in the groves of Academe. Hall Jr. (1974: 4) voiced his concerns thus: “Despite general recognition of Wodehouse’s merits as a stylist, however, there has been relatively little detailed analysis of the features that have contributed to his almost unparalleled success in humorous writing.” Approaching the topic of Wodehouse from the point of view of translation, this sad account of Vuotari-Filenius (2001: 6) does not seem to testify against Hall Jr’s words: “As regards Wodehouse’s language and style, the translation of P.G. Wodehouse into Finnish has not been studied for some reason.” Yet scholars are still of the opinion that Wodehouse’s works are by no means exiguous in terms of literary value. In her paper, Siironen (2000: 3) waxes eloquent

¹ Quote from *The Code of the Woosters* by P.G. Wodehouse (1938 / 2008).

about the merits of Wodehouse: “P. G. Wodehouse may have written about trivial things, but in my opinion he was no less an artist than James Joyce or William Faulkner. His mastery is only of a different kind. In many respects, Wodehouse can be seen as a highly creative writer of a discredited genre.”

Wodehouse is also renowned for his use of language and stylistic devices, being “much admired and envied professionally by his fellow writers” (Usbourne: 1976: 14). When looking further into his particular style, it becomes apparent that interjections also play a noticeable role in it.

Therefore, it seems like a fairly reasonable idea to merge the two hitherto little-studied topics. But in order to make the focus of this study truly a novelty, I’m going to approach the amalgam from the perspective of translation. Now, keeping all this in mind, the research question of this thesis is: **how the Wodehousian interjections have been translated in the target texts and what kind of implications do the translation strategies bring about?** The “how” here refers to both the translation strategies employed in the translation process and the actual equivalents chosen by the translator. When studying the implications, I will be focusing on two main aspects: the categories and the functions of the interjections. These will be expatiated on later.

But of course, before the analysis can be conducted, there are certain points which require clarification. Seeing that one has embarked on the study of interjections, it becomes absolutely essential to define what those things are in the first place, and that’s exactly what I’ll be doing in the theory section of this thesis. In that chapter, I shall attempt to establish a provisional consensus on the definition of interjections, how they can be categorised, and what kind of things can be expressed with them. What’s more, I am going to discover what kind of strategies a translator can resort to when translating interjections. The theoretical chapter will conclude with an additional analysis on Wodehouse’s style, so that the attribute “Wodehousian” can actually be given meaningful proportions in relation to style and interjections especially.

In the third chapter, a more closer look will be given to the material, which comprises three books belonging to the Jeeves series: *Right Ho, Jeeves* (1934), *The*

Code of the Woosters (1938), and *Joy in the Morning* (1946). The translations for the three have been made by Kaisa Sivenius, and they appear in two omnibuses: *Kiitos, Jeeves* (2009) and *Hiiop, Jeeves* (2010). I will also shed some light on the rationale for picking these particular works for the thesis. Some words will also be dedicated to the method utilised in this thesis.

The fourth chapter will be reserved wholly for the analysis itself, which will be mostly of a quantitative nature, with some qualitative elements thrown in for good measure. The results thereof will be summarised in the grand finale, Conclusions.

Let the research commence.

2 “I ventured to interject.”² - The Theory

This chapter is dedicated to the concept of interjections, i.e. what constitutes an interjection and what kind of different things can be expressed with such items. I will not only clarify the concept from the point of view of linguistics and translation studies, but I shall furthermore enlarge on two different categorisation methods of it: the division between primary, secondary, and complex interjections, and the classification of interjections into sub-groups based on their function. The foregoing categories and sub-groups will be formed of different sources, as scholars haven't yet managed to reach a clear-cut consensus on the respective topics.

Also, seeing that research is conducted in the field of translation studies, I'm going to open up Cuenca's (2006) six-step model of strategies for translating interjections.

Finally, I shall take a look at Wodehouse's style and the idiolect of the narrator of the Jeeves books, Bertie Wooster, in particular to establish which elements to include in the analysis. In relation to this matter, I will defer to the judgment of both veteran Wodehouse aficionados such as Hall Jr. (1974) and Usbourne (1976) and more recent P.G. enthusiasts, such as Stille (2012).

2.1 Interjections

First of all, it would be advised to establish what is meant by interjections by and large. Cuenca's (2006: 20) view on the matter is, in light of the musings of researchers such as Ameka and Goffman, that interjections are “peripheral to language and similar to nonlinguistic items such as gestures and vocal paralinguistic devices.” Not a very encouraging start, and Ameka (1992a: 101) further rubs it in by stating that “this class of items has eluded description and has, for the most part, been ignored in theoretical linguistics discourse.” The author of this thesis has yet to come across an all-encompassing definition which would expel any doubts lingering in the minds of sceptics, but that doesn't mean the situation is hopeless. By dint of different takes on the topic of interjections, an ad hoc definition can be constructed for the sake of the argument.

² Quote from *Carry On, Jeeves* by P. G. Wodehouse (1925 / 2009).

From a grammatical point of view, VISK (§ 856) defines interjections as conventionalised units of linguistic action, in other words ritualistic ways of expressing affectivity towards unexpected happenings or turns in the course of events, whether there are any other interlocutors present or not. According to VISK, the most salient feature of interjections is their reactivity: they are used as instruments to react to something that has taken place, to something previously intimated, or to the emotional state of the interlocutor. Some of the examples mentioned in the chapter include *aah*, *huhhuh*, *höh*, *loiskis*, and *voi perkele kuitenkin*. The protean nature of the grammatical class of interjections is also stressed, despite the presence of some fixed expressions.

Givón (1993: 81-82) takes the stance of VISK a couple of pegs further by opining that interjections comprise a “heterogeneous class with a broad range of functions, most commonly involving expressive and social-interactive functions.” This includes both the definition of VISK and in addition directs the topics towards a larger social-interactive context. Wilkins (1992: 120) strengthens these views by further averring that interjections have both a semantically rich nature and a definite conceptual structure, being definitely a part of language.

Then again, there are dissenting opinions to this particular view: As Wharton (2003: 174) pointed out, there are scholars who regard interjections not as linguistic units, but ritualised acts which are “analysed in terms of the socio-communicative roles they play, rather than any linguistic content they may have.” While this is not a point to be disregarded with a brusque shrug, it will be overruled pro tem by reason of the opposition of the earlier sources I’ve proffered, especially keeping in mind VISK’s point that no other interlocutors need not be present in the situation for an expression to constitute an interjection. Besides, as Cuenca (2000: 31) notes in her paper: “Interjections vary from one language to another. This means that they are linguistically encoded and, thus, better seen as linguistic elements.” (There are objections to this linguistic encodability view, like that of Cruz’s (2009: 244): “[The meaning of interjections] is not linguistically encoded and cannot be decomposed in identifiable discrete elements. Suffice it to remember that in many interjections we cannot trace a phrasal and, not the least, a clausal or sentential structure.” It will soon become apparent why such an argument can be rebuffed, however.)

Now I have managed to find a convenient consensus about interjections being part of language and that they offer interlocutors a means to express themselves in different contexts. But to truly understand the nature of interjections, further definition is called for. First it must be decided what category interjections belong to, so that the scope of the research could be restricted.

By adapting a prototype approach to her classifying endeavours, Cuenca (2000: 30) has essayed to crush four hypotheses about interjections which, according to her, seem to prevail:

1. They are not grammatical nor even linguistic items.
2. They can be grouped together with other categories, namely adverbs or particles.
3. They are sentences or sentence-equivalents.
4. They constitute a separate grammatical category.

As the first point has already been proven to be moot, I shall move on to the second one without further ado. Cuenca (2000: 31) is willing to concede to the fact that interjections, adverbs, and particles all share the quality of being morphologically invariable and manifesting subjective values. However, she doesn't see those qualities as decisively characteristic features of any class, since prepositions, conjunctions, and adverbs all share the former quality, and the latter doesn't apply to all items falling under the category of adverbs. She then delivers the coup de maître by concluding that interjections and adverbs are not even used in a similar fashion, for the former can stand on their own. Ergo, interjections are syntactically dependent, and they can be considered sentence equivalents rather than elements. Ameka (1992a: 114) makes the triumph even greater by stating that, as regards particles or discourse markers, interjections are just one linguistic element among verbs, adjectives etc. which can serve as discourse markers, thus undermining the hypothesis.

Onwards to hypothesis three. Cuenca makes it fairly clear that interjections, indeed, act eerily akin to sentences, but there are two vital differences: First, interjections don't include a subject plus predicate, and secondly, they don't have an integrated lexical meaning to them – they “express pragmatic meanings such as surprise, joy,

pain, etc.” (Cuenca 2000: 32). And so, upon brooding on the fourth hypothesis, which Cuenca dismisses by virtue of interjections having too many commonalities with other word classes to constitute a nice and concise class of their own, yet too little commonalities to comfortably fit in one of the pre-existing categories, it is concluded that interjections would best be regarded as a peripheral sentence class (and hence arguments such as that of Cruz become less valid). So it shall be.

Cuenca refuses to let the matter rest, however. In her opinion (2000: 33), syntactical, pragmatical, phonological, and morphological perspectives must also be considered in order to come to at least some kind of a conclusion as to a proper definition. (I will forgo the matter of phonology in this thesis because the material under scrutiny comprises only textual information.) In Cuenca’s opinion (2000: 34), the stumbling block here is the outlier status of interjections – that they are more united by their irregularities rather than regularities. Indeed, Ameka (1992a: 105) states the following: “interjections [...] tend to be phonologically and morphologically anomalous. They may thus be made up of sounds and sound sequences that are not found in other parts of the language.” Jespersen (1924: 90) casts more aspersions on the concept of a unified class of interjections: “The only thing that these elements have in common is their ability to stand alone as a complete utterance.” To top it all, Wharton (2009: 97) asseverates: “Interjections are such a disparate, non-unified group of expressions [...]; any adequate account of interjections should reflect this heterogeneity.”

However, Wilkins (1995: 381) has studied that “it is possible to identify, cross-linguistically, a form class of items that are simple lexemes conventionally used as utterances. [...] there is clearly a reasonable degree of functional, semantic, and pragmatic unity to [interjections]” He (1992: 153) opines that, upon careful consideration, interjections can constitute both morphologically and syntactically unified class, if there are no additional morphemes added to the interjectional body of the word. Cuenca (2000: 42) also interpolates a very important observation to the discussion, which will bear upon the analysis section of this thesis: “Since interjections encode subjective meanings, it is clear that subjectification is at play when a phrase is reanalyzed as an interjection.”

In fine, one has managed to establish an ad hoc definition of the status of interjections in relation to other classes of words, and consequently one has managed to rule out elements which do not appertain to the study at hand. The author of this thesis would still like to crave for the reader's indulgence, for he must proceed to the subcategorisation matters in order to establish the concept of interjections more fully. But let's establish something of utmost importance first: henceforth, as implored by Ameka (1992a: 103), the word 'interjection' is reserved strictly for the class, whereas the sentence-level words will be termed as 'exclamations.'

2.1.1 Primary, secondary, and complex interjections

Because interjections as a species of class has been called out for its ambiguity, it shouldn't come as a surprise that doubt has also been cast on their purity, i.e. where to draw the line between interjections and other elements. Ameka (1992a: 105) tendered a solution to this conundrum by proposing to make a division between interjections: **primary**, **secondary**, and **complex** ones.

In order for an interjection to be classified as primary, Ameka stipulates that it must not be used otherwise. Wharton (2003: 175) sheds more light on the matter by stating that "these items are non-productive in the sense that they do not inflect and are not movable between word-classes." Ameka (1992a: 105), however, is not so rigid when it comes to movability; in his opinion, it is merely infrequent. While theoretically the movement is possible, in this thesis this category only includes exclamations which are used as interjections only, such as the ones mentioned by Ameka (ibid.): *oh*, *wow*, *gee*, *oops*, and *ouch*.

Interjections ought to be consigned to a secondary position in Ameka's opinion if they're "forms that belong to other word classes based on their semantics and are interjections only because they can occur by themselves non-elliptically as one-word utterances" (1992a: 105.) He (ibid.) says that while those expressions have independent semantic value embedded in them, they are used to express a mental attitude or state, and hence can be regarded as mental acts. Ameka (1992a: 111) puts forward such exclamatory examples as *shame*, *damn*, *help*, *careful*, and *Christ*. It is furthermore suggested by Cuenca (2006: 22) that secondary interjections can comprise primary interjections and words of affirmation and negation, such as *oh*, *no*.

Ameka (1992a: 111) does also advocate a distinction to be made with secondary interjections and interjectional phrases (such as *dear me*), because “interjection as a label characterises a class of words and should not be used confusingly to describe utterance types.” While this division would indeed be conducive to lucidity, it’s however based on a premise which would run contrary to the conclusion established in the earlier chapter, to wit, that interjections are a peripheral sentence class. Ergo, one has to decline the possibility grudgingly.

The third category, viz. complex interjections, are reserved for constructions which are “multi-morphemic ones which constitute a phonological word” (Ameka 1992a: 111.) Ameka (ibid.) offers a *goddammit* as a paradigm complex interjection. As I’ve stated earlier, this thesis is not phonologically charged, and thus complex interjections are regarded only as constructions which form one word yet contain multiple morphemes.

Unfortunately, these categories are by no means hard and fast. Aijmer & Rühlemann (2014: 255) argue that a primary interjection “can be pressed into service as another part of speech, so that it would appear to be a secondary interjection from a purely synchronic perspective.” They (ibid.) instance *wow* and *pooh*, which have both come to be used as verbs, and hence they would appear to belong to the secondary interjection category. Aijmer & Rühlemann (ibid.) also make another point worth considering, when it comes to etymology: Words like *jeez* and *golly* are respectively derived from *Jesus* and *God*, which, according to the foregoing definition by Ameka, would demote such exclamations to the category of secondary interjections by reason of semantics, even though they are generally regarded as primary interjections. Because it is indubitably challenging to vouch for the original meaning of a word at a point when it entered into the general vocabulary of the speakers of any given language, the author of this thesis would like to propose that, should the expression have any other entries in *Oxford Dictionaries* than the exclamatory one, let it be held secondary.

There is also some disagreement as to the inclusion of onomatopoeic words, which could be generally considered as belonging to primary interjections. Ameka (1992a: 113) for example states that “onomatopoeic words, etc. tend to be descriptive, rather than expressive of a mental state as interjections are.” However, Cuenca (2000: 37)

does include onomatopoeic expressions in her categorisation, whereof I shall talk about later on. I would also like to remark, that expressions such as *coo* do have an expressive side to them (according to *Oxford Dictionaries*, the aforementioned exclamation could be defined as “used to express surprise”) even though they have entered the language as imitative elements. Therefore it may be concluded, that Ameka’s generalisation may be a bit too broad for the time being.

A lack of consensus with respect to secondary interjections is even more marked. By going with Coulmas’s (1981: 2-3) definition of routines, which is “highly conventionalised prepatterned expressions whose occurrence is tied to more or less standard communication situations,” Ameka (1992a: 108-109) stressed that while it could be claimed that interjections are somewhat akin to routines, they should not be confounded with them. He (ibid.) says that with primary interjections, a potential mix-up is improbable, since routines usually comprise several words. The problems arise, however, when we’re discussing expressions such as *thank you*, *sorry*, and *bye*. According to Ameka (1992a: 109), these ought not to be pigeon-holed as interjections, because they are “intentional and socially expected reactions to situations” instead of “spontaneous immediate responses.” Wierzbicka (1992: 164) rejects the idea of including expressions such as *good heavens* or *Christ* as interjections in the first place because of their lexical content.

The author of this thesis would like to interpolate at this point, in response to Ameka’s views, that it would pose a needlessly recondite element on the analysis of interjections should such matters as spontaneity and social conventions be taken into consideration – who is to define such elements in the first place? Wharton (2003: 191) seems to side with this view, for he states that “whether or not what is communicated is an emotional attitude is dependent on there being a cognitive element interacting with the qualitative and the physiological.” On further deliberation, the examples Ameka presented to illustrate the nature of secondary interjections, such as *help* and *careful*, could hardly be said to be merely spontaneous.

Cuenca (2000: 33) does not consider expressions like *Good heavens* problematic: in her paper, she demonstrates how the aforementioned expression can be substituted with the phrase ‘I am really surprised.’ (This substitution, as we established earlier, is one of the criteria with which to single out interjections.) She holds that the kernel of

the matter is in grammaticalisation: “secondary interjections result from a process of syntactic reanalysis – from sentence constituent to sentential expression – and semantic change – from a literal meaning to a more abstract, pragmatic one. [...] the main features of grammaticalization” (Cuenca 2000: 40.) Hence the constituents of expressions such as *Good heavens* should not be taken literally at any point, but they ought to be considered pragmatically. According to Wilkins (1992: 125) “phrases may become conventionally fixed and used as interjections.” He included phrases such as *bloody hell* and *thank you* to consolidate his assertion.

I’m inclined to follow in the footsteps of Cuenca and Wilkins in the matter of secondary interjections, because their approach underlines the pragmatic nature of interjection – the idea of the expression can be brought to light by substituting the interjection with a sentence. Ameka and Wierzbicka tend to concentrate on the literal side of things, which doesn’t seem to befit interjections at all. In addition to that, by adapting the methods of Cuenca and Wilkins, the categorisation of the interjections studied herein would be simplified considerably. Thus one needn’t go into the social deliberations of the interlocutors nor does one have to start weighing the conventionality of the lexemes which are morphed into a secondary interjection.

2.1.2 Interjections classified according to function

Now that the cardinal tripartite division of interjections has been conducted, I may continue to dissect our subject even further. It has already been shown how interjections can be classified according to their semantic properties in relation to other word classes, but it yet remains to be seen how they can be apportioned to different categories based on their manner of expression.

Ameka (1992a: 113) is particularly partial to another tripartite divisional manoeuvre: He’d have interjections allotted to **expressive**, **conative**, and **phatic** brackets.

The expressive interjections “may be characterised as the vocal gestures which are symptoms of the speaker’s mental state,” (ibid.) and, moreover, they can be halved into **emotive** and **cognitive** segments. By emotive interjections Ameka (ibid.) means those which shed light on what the interlocutor is experiencing in terms of emotions

and sensations, whereof Ameka instances such exclamations and their subjective interpretations as *yuk* (I feel disgust) and *wow* (I am surprised). The cognitive half is then the harbour for exclamations which seek to convey “the state of knowledge and thoughts at the time of utterance,” (ibid.) sporting such examples as *aha* (I now know this) and *ehe* (I now remember). According to Wierzbicka’s (2003: 291) definitions of the two emotive ones can be paraphrased as ‘I feel something’ and cognitive ones as ‘I know something’ (yet which doesn’t include the emotive paraphrase). Both of the definitions will be implemented in this thesis, seeing that there aren’t any incongruences between them.

Ameka (ibid.) defines conative interjections as “those expressions which are directed at an auditor. They are either aimed at getting someone’s attention or they demand an action or response from someone of a speaker’s wants.” He uses *sh* (I want silence here) as an example, and the author of this thesis wishes to suggest one of his own: *chop chop*, which could be paraphrased as ‘I want you to hurry up.’ The conative interjection roughly corresponds to Wierzbicka’s (2003: 291) volitive interjection, in other words, those which can be paraphrased as ‘I want something’ but which do not include the emotive constituent. I suggest a compromise in this case: we’ll defer to Ameka in terms of nomenclature, yet we’ll avail ourselves of the paraphrasal expedient put forward by Wierzbicka when analysing the intended message of exclamations under scrutiny.

The last in the list, phatic interjections, are used to keep up the flow of conversation and to make sure the established contact between the interlocutors is not ebbing (Ameka 1992a: 114). In Ameka’s opinion, phatic interjections are such as to indicate the speaker’s mental attitude towards the nature of the on-going conversation, such as backchannels or feedback. Included in this category are such items as *mhm* and *yeah*, but all the same one could include expressions such as *cor blimey* and *well I’ll go to the foot of our stairs*, both of them being eloquent of incredulity yet also of the possible desire to hear more about the matter.

The foregoing categories are by no means the only prevailing classes used for interjections. Because it is generally debatable whether onomatopoeic expressions or routines and formulae ought to be let in the interjection club, the more exclusively minded scholars like Ameka naturally do not wish to include them in their

classifications. However, as it was established earlier, some researches welcome such elements with open arms. Among them is Cuenca (2000: 37-38), who proffers two additional categories: **referential** and **metalinguistic**. (It should be noted that while Cuenca agrees with the three definitions made by Ameka above, she incorporates exclamations such as *hi*, *goodbye* and *sorry* in the phatic category. We shall adhere to this inclusion in this thesis.)

Cuenca (ibid.) uses the referential category simply to include onomatopoeic expressions only. Her definition of the metalinguistic interjections class is rather more complicated, however. To her, the term metalinguistic "corresponds to those interjections used as discourse markers like *right*, *huh*, *eh*, etc. which sometimes can also have a conative or a phatic component" (ibid.) On the other hand, Matamala (2009: 488) offers the following clarification: "They are the key elements which demarcate units of speech in conversational exchanges, e.g. look, well or listen." While both Cuenca and Matamala might be after the same thing, it seems like Matamala's explanation is more distinctive in relation to phatic and conative interjections, and hence it will be definition for metalinguistic interjections for this thesis.

Now, there's also Givón (1993: 81-82), who allots three main categories for interjections: **epistemic**, **deontic**, and **evaluative**. While I'm going to explain them using Givón's definitions, I'm planning to supply my own examples in absence of those of the scholar. It should be noted, that as the classifications are based on the functions of interjections, several expressions can belong to different categories, depending on the context.

For the interlocutor who sees fit to contribute to a hypothetical discussion with an interjection, the epistemic expression intimates their views on the veracity of the information received. Fitting examples of such exclamations would be *right*, *nonsense*, or *that's rich*. Deontic exclamations do not concern themselves with the information provided, but with the interlocutor's assent or dissent towards the actions of the other conversing party. Here instances such as *stop it* and *whoa* would be most admirable. Finally, the evaluative category is reserved for the interlocutor's preferences on actions or states of affairs, for example *no way* or *crikey*. Givón (1993: 82) flings the rest of the potential functions under the label of "Others" which "may

signal surprise, incomprehension, question, uncertainty, social insecurity, and many more.”

Obviously, the “Others” category is not to the purpose in this thesis, but the perspectives of truthfulness are bound to be advantageous. However, in order not to over-complicate matters, the three categories introduced by Givón will be treated as sub-categories in relation to the five main categories above. They will not be used to describe the function of the interjection in its entirety, but they are rather additional elements used to clarify the stance of the interlocutor towards something.

Thus far I have managed to somewhat establish what the everyday interlocutor can express, should they resort to interjecting. Before advancing to other matters, it would be most befitting to introduce a disclaimer at this point. I contrived to winkle out earlier that there’s an appreciable subjective basis to dealing with elements such as interjections, and hence it would be advised to note that the classification as per the above-mentioned regulations is bound to be not completely unobjectionable. To make things more simple in the name of academic progress, the interjections studied in this thesis can be assigned to several categories; yet the question of the preponderant category of each exclamation will not be dwelt upon.

2.1.3 Translating interjections

There has been relatively little research conducted on the translation of interjections, and the only sources the author of this thesis could find were dealing mostly with audiovisual translation (a couple of these will be mentioned shortly). As a result, this sub-sub-chapter will be mostly drawing on Cuenca’s findings and her translatorial model for interjections, the latter of which being particularly useful in the analysis.

As Cuenca (2006: 21) so aptly – yet hardly in a revelatory fashion – put it, translating interjections is not a matter of merely translating words, because of their idiomatic nature and their peculiar nature of being a peripheral class of sentences. She holds forth about the matter in more detail:

“It implies translating discourse meanings which are language-specific and culturally bound. The translator must interpret its semantic and pragmatic meaning and its

context of use, and then look for a form (interjection or not) which can convey that meaning and produce an identical or similar effect on the audience” (ibid.)

By adapting Baker’s (1992) proposal on translating idioms and building on it slightly, Cuenca (2006: 27) has come up with six different translation strategies for interjections, and they have been confirmed practically effective by at least Thawabteh (2010) and Shahraki et al. (2012). The strategies are as follows (with English-to-Spanish/Catalan translatorial examples by courtesy of Cuenca (2006: 27-28)):

Strategy a) – Literal translation

Charles: You’re joking.

Carrie: Oh, no.

Charles: **God**, for a moment there I thought I was in “Fatal Attraction.”

Charles: Bromeas.

Carrie: [laughing]

Charles: **Dios** [lit: ‘God’], por un momento me he visto en Atracción Fatal.

Strategy b) – Translation by using an interjection with dissimilar form but the same meaning

Tom: Well, do sit, do sit there, Deirdre. [Talking to himself] **Golly**. Thunderbolt City.

Tom: Pues siéntate. Siéntate aquí, Deirdre. [Talking to himself] **Santo cielo** [lit: ‘Holy heaven’]. Ha sido un flechazo.

Strategy c) – Translation by using a non-interjective structure with similar meaning

Scarlett: **Blimey**.

Tom: At least, this one we won’t forget. I mean, a lot of weddings just blend into each other, don’t they?

Scarlett: **Menudo follón!** [lit: 'What a fuss']

Tom: Seguro que ésta no la olvidaremos. Porque uno termina mezclando unas bodas con otras

Strategy d) – Translation by using an interjection with a different meaning

Barman: Your whisky, sir.

Charles: Thanks.

Barman: And the one for the...

Charles: ...road. **Lovely.**

Barman: El seu whisky, senyor.

Charles: Gràcies.

Barman: I un altre per...

Charles: pel camí. **Gràcies** [lit: 'thank you']

Strategy e) – Omission

Charles: **Shit.** Find a... Find a doctor.

Tom: Right. Okay.

Charles: **Ø** Llamad, llamad a un médico.

Tom: Bien. Enseguida

Strategy f) – Addition of elements

Man: **God**, you are drunk if you can't even remember you've got a wife.

Man: **Ah, Dios** [lit: 'Uh, God'], si no recuerdas que tienes mujer es que estás borracho

Since Cuenca doesn't offer a further insight into the use of these categories, and since there's always a degree of ambiguity and context-boundness in such categorisation, I'm going to explain the particular criteria for the application of these

strategies later on in the analysis section after the applicable interjections for the analysis have been delineated.

One thing should be taken into account here: the strategies here only seem to have been used in connection with audiovisual translation hitherto. While this might appear to provide a rickety basis for the evaluation of textual material in novels, I think it's worth noting that Cuenca's categorisation does not include any elements which would be intrinsically connected to audiovisual translation. Therefore, it should be safe enough to adapt them for the purposes of this thesis.

2.2 Wodehouse's style in relation to interjections

Because the scope of this thesis is restricted to interjections which are seen to belong to the writing style of P.G. Wodehouse, some sort of delineation of the latter is called for in order to leave out the more mundane elements. It should be taken for granted that some of the expressions commonly found in Wodehouse's stories may be excluded here, because not everything is pointed out in writings regarding his style. In order to keep the research conducted in this paper strictly academic, one must go by the "general consensus" instead of hearsay or gut feeling, so apologies in advance to those who are likely to rue the absence of their favourite *tally-hos* and *odd's-boddikins*.

According to Prasad (2004), there's a general consensus among the critics that Wodehouse's world is an amalgam of three different time periods: the Jazz Age or the 1920s, the Edwardian period (1901-1910), and the early Gregorian period ranging from 1714 to 1837. Moreover, there are researchers like Usborne (1961: 160) who, when discussing the language of Bertie Wooster, maintain that by the 1930s Wodehouse had managed to create a language of his own for Bertie's personal use.

Bertie Wooster is the sole narrator of the Jeeves novels, narrating the stories strictly from the point of view of first person (Usborne 1961: 152). That's why it is paramount that one looks more closely on his particular mode of expression. When discussing the idiolect of Bertie and his associates, Hall Jr. (1974: 94) instances a great variety of expressions of farewell: *bung-oh*, *teuf-teuf*, *tinkerty-tonk*, *pip-pip*,

and *toodle-oo*. Usborne (1961: 69) terms such parlance as that of a Knut, who, according to him, was not Wodehouse's invention, but a "fashion-eddy of early Edwardianism, though his line goes back to the dandy and the fop of earlier centuries." Prasad (2004) also notes the utilisation of uncommon valedictory expressions, naming such examples as *what-ho* (which also works as a greeting), *pip-pip*, *toodle-oo*, and *tinkerty-tonk*, three of which coincide with the list made by Hall Jr. above. Moreover, Stille has studied the translatability of "Wodehouse-ian [...]" expressions such as 'Right ho', 'by Jove', 'Tinkerty Tonk', 'Dash it' and 'What ho'" (2012: 1) in her thesis, which was principally based on the research of the book *Right Ho, Jeeves*. According to *Oxford Dictionaries*, *right ho* is an exclamation used to express agreement or assent, *by Jove* is a dated exclamation used for special emphasis or to express surprise, and *dash it* is an exclamation expressing mild annoyance.

When speaking of Wodehouse's style in general, Hall Jr. (1974: 80) states that among the variegated stylistic devices exploited by Wodehouse is the use of archaic lexical items, which he implements in pursuit of humorous incongruence.

Wodehouse's propensity to introduce informal elements into his dialogues is also remarked upon: Hall Jr. (1974: 69) instances *coo*, the exclamation of surprise used by lower-class Londoners. When deciding which interjections to include in the analysis, Hall Jr.'s notion of archaisms will be taken into consideration: If an exclamation found in the source texts is categorised as archaic in the *Oxford Dictionaries*, it will be included. (Items which are marked merely as dated will not be allowed for, because some of the expression which were in common use back then are classified as dated today, and consequently they could not have had the incongruent effect Wodehouse would've strove for.) Likewise, if the exclamations are such as to be labelled as informal, such as *coo*, they will also be included. (Admittedly, many other dictionaries could've been chosen in lieu of *Oxford Dictionaries*, but there are always some slight discrepancies between dictionaries, and so the author of this thesis saw it fit to stick to one and only. The choice was more or less arbitrary, yet the pick was also motivated by trustworthiness.)

Thus one has contrived to formulate suitably exclusive criteria for deciding which exclamations to take in for our study. However, as the hawk-eyed reader probably

perceived, there are some slight differences in the orthography between the exclamations instanced above. Such small details will not be taken into account here; all exclamations are welcome to partake in this study, whether hyphenated or slightly modified. A good example of the latter would be the expression *bung-oh*, which was written as *bung-ho* by Usborne (1961: 69).

3 “You know my methods, Jeeves. Apply them.”³ - The Material and Methods

Three different Jeeves novels by P.G. Wodehouse were chosen for this thesis: *Right Ho, Jeeves* (1934), *The Code of the Woosters* (1938), and *Joy in the Morning* (1946). There are several reasons which led to the decision to include the aforementioned triumvirate. Firstly, they’re all of the same series, narrated by the same character and as a result are fairly consistent in their style. Secondly, they were released in succession and under a relatively short time span to boot, which furthermore consolidates the consistency. Thirdly, the inclusion of three different books of the same series demonstrates the trend of recurring idiosyncratic expressions which could be termed “Wodehousian.” Fourthly, each book brings something slightly new to the game expression-wise, and so the research will be less homogeneous. Finally, to the best of the knowledge of the author of this thesis, the latter two novels have not been studied heretofore in terms of translation. This doesn’t render *Right Ho, Jeeves* any less suitable for the current endeavour, however: the sheer fact, that the title of the novel features a characteristic Wodehousian exclamation in itself is not to be ignored when it comes to translation strategies.

The translations of the source texts were made by Kaisa Sivenius, and they appeared in *Kiitos, Jeeves* (2009) and *Hiiop, Jeeves* (2010) omnibuses, the first one containing *Right Ho, Jeeves* and the second *The Code of the Woosters* and *Joy in the Morning*. The target texts were chosen by reason of their availability, but also because they were translated by one person and that the translations were ostensibly done in succession. Hence the assumption that the translator most likely did not change her strategies radically from story to story should not be deemed unreasonable.

I have singled out the exclamations from the source texts in concordance with the criteria laid down in the preceding sub-chapter. Accordingly, the equivalents were picked from the target texts.

The exclamations of both the source and the target texts will be classified in accordance with the functional classification established in the theory chapter. Moreover, the translations will be pigeon-holed in the pertinent translation strategy

³ Quote from *Right Ho, Jeeves* by P.G. Wodehouse (1934 / 2000).

categories. I will then analyse how the translator has chosen to translate the exclamations in the story, how consistent the translator has been with her choices, and what kind of implications the translated exclamations might have in terms of their category and function. The research is then both quantitative and qualitative, but it should be noted that the dichotomy of good / bad translation is not of any concern here. One observes, yet one doesn't judge. The purpose of this thesis is merely to demonstrate interjectional intricacies.

4 “Like Jeeves, Wodehouse stands alone, and analysis is useless.”⁴

- The Analysis

Firstly, I’ll take a look at the exclamations which were extracted from the Wodehouse books. They will be first analysed in terms of the criteria by which they were chosen. Once that is done, they will be classified as either primary, secondary, or complex. What follows is the final categorisation based on the functions the exclamations performed in the source text. It ought to be kept in mind that the functional categorisation is more descriptive of the potentiality of the exclamations rather than what they are used for at every single instance. Thus an exclamation can be phatic at one point, yet it can have an expressive quality to it at another point.

Secondly, I’ll immerse myself in translatorial matters, studying what kind of translation strategies were applied with sufficient examples, which also shed light on the context the expression is used in. After that, I’ll move on to explore the different kinds of interjectional categories and functions and the possible changes the exclamations have undergone during the translation process. In the categorial section, the retention of the categories will also be focused on.

4.1 Exclamations in the source texts

By applying the criteria established in the second chapter, a grand tally of 172 exclamations were picked from the source texts. The following ones were name-dropped by Wodehouse scholars, and thus they were deemed to be analytically ideal: *bung-ho*, *by Jove*, *dash it*, *ho*, *pip-pip*, *right-ho*, *tinkerty-tonk*, *toodle-oo*, and *what ho*. A perspicacious reader might have detected an item which was not necessarily mentioned in itself, to wit, *ho*. This stowaway was included for two reasons. According to *Oxford Dictionaries*, the word is used as an element in various exclamation, for example *what ho*. As it’s an integral part of some exclamations that have been labelled Wodehousian by the researchers, it ought to be considered valid for the current research.

By consulting the trusty *Oxford Dictionaries*, the following archaic exclamation of surprise, anger, or affirmation was identified in the source texts: *egad*. Similarly, *coo*

⁴ Quote from Stephen Fry. Source: <http://www.pgwodehousebooks.com/fry.htm>

and *golly* were classified as informal exclamations of surprise, and hence they were allowed to enter into the present study.

Only two of the exclamations mentioned belong to the primary interjection class: *egad* and *toodle-oo*. The secondary interjections were more numerous: *by Jove*, *coo*, *dash it*, *golly*, *ho*, *right ho*, and *what ho*. (The point about *golly* being secondary might be a bit moot, since it is merely an informal synonym for *golliwog*, but academic rigour must be adhered to.) Consequently, all the rest (*bung-ho*, *pip-pip*, and *tinkerty-tonk*) belong to the complex interjection class. The inclusion of *bung-ho* is justified by the fact that it only appears as a hyphenated construction in the source texts, whereas all the other so-called ‘ho constructions’ appear both with and without the punctuation mark.

Let’s consider the functions now. *Bung-ho* was only included once in the three books, in the following passage:

- (1) Gussie, you see, wasn’t like some of my pals [...] who, if turned down by a girl, would simply say, ‘Well, **bung-ho!**’ and toddle off quite happily to find another. (Right Ho, Jeeves, p. 117)

As it was intimated by Hall Jr. (1974: 94), *bung-ho* is considered an expression of farewell, and hence it can be labelled as phatic. But keeping in mind the subjective nature of the classification, it could be said that the expression also has a tinge of the expressive in it. As the subject of the excerpt above is sundered hearts, the expression brings a touch of nonchalance to the play with its briskness, and therefore definitely has an emotive side to it.

By Jove was primarily used as an expressive interjection, but there was at least one instance, where the expression could be said to be classified as a phatic interjection:

- (2) ‘Ah, but he’s had a refreshing sleep since then, and you know how a spot of sleep picks you up. And, **by Jove**, Uncle Percy, I’ll tell you something I’ve just remembered. ...’ (Joy in the Morning, p. 189–190)

Other than the obvious emotive intent, the expression is also ostensibly used for both conative and phatic purposes: the speaker wants to get Uncle Percy’s attention, yet they also want to keep the conversation a-going. But at the end of the day, I think it’s best to place *by Jove* into the phatic and expressive categories only, because the

conative element could be said to be a bit too ambiguous and contrived: the interlocutor already seems to have Uncle Percy's ear.

In addition to the obvious expressive qualities of *dash it*, the exclamation also proved to be metalinguistically capable:

- (3) *No, but **dash it**, listen. Honestly, you don't want me. Get Fink-Nottle distribute prizes. A born distributor, who will do you credit.* (Right Ho, Jeeves, p. 63)

Ho continues this trend of expressiveness. However, this item is far from unambiguous in its usage. Consider the two following examples:

- (4) Boko, who is always a perfect host, bade the newcomer a cheery good morning, and asked him to keep his [Stilton] mouth open and he would throw a sardine into it. But apparently the latter had already breakfasted, for he declined the invitation with a petulant jerk of the head.
'**Ho!**' he [Stilton] said. (Joy in the Morning, p. 234)
- (5) I had a shot at an airy 'Ah, there you are, Stilton,' but my heart was not in it, and it elicited no response except a short '**Ho!**' Having got off this '**Ho!**' which, as I have explained, was in the nature of a sort of signature tune, he addressed himself to Boko. (Joy in the Morning, p. 254)

The expressive element is definitely present, but it could be said that there is something conative about the way *ho* is used. In (4), the utterer of the exclamation makes known that he is not up for the proposed feeding scheme, whereas in (5) he makes it known to the other interlocutor that they're not exactly on his friends list, and thus they should hold their peace.

Pip-pip is the first one on the list that could be regarded as referential by virtue of its onomatopoeic nature. This is proven by *Oxford Dictionaries'* speculation on the expression's origin: "imitative, probably of the repeated short blasts on the horn of a motor car or bicycle." But as it was stated by Hall Jr. (1974: 94), it is also used as a valedictory. Hence it will be pigeon-holed as a phatic interjection too.

Right ho is mostly used to signal understanding or assent in these stories, and hence it can be classified as expressive, in the cognitive sense. However, the exclamation is clearly more than that, as professed by the following example:

- (6) 'But in the present case I have no such misgivings. Each of the contracting parties, in my opinion, has picked a winner, and it is with a light heart that I shall purchase the necessary fish slice. I am even prepared, if desired, to be best man and make a speech at the wedding breakfast, and one cannot say

more than that.'

'No, sir.'

'**Right ho**, Jeeves,' I said, flinging back the bedclothes and rising from the couch. 'Unchain the eggs and bacon. I will be with you in a moment.' (Joy in the Morning, p. 38)

Here the exclamation seems to be more of a phatic item, since there is no need to express assent in the current case. The exclamation is used to comment on the current topic, which the interlocutor deems most satisfactory. Furthermore, the expression seems to be fit into the metalinguistic category as well:

- (7) It seemed to me that I had made out a pretty good one, and I anticipated the 'resigned '**Right ho**. Yes, I see what you mean. I suppose you're right.' (The Code of the Woosters, p. 181–182)

There is always enough leeway given to the reader for them to presume that the exclamation here would be yet another indicator of assent. The quote could be understood to just hammer home the fact that the interlocutor has understood something. But personally, I think it acts as a discourse marker. 'Yes, I see what you mean' could be taken to be the first realisation of the interlocutor, and if that's the case, the *right ho* would be strangely tautological in that regard.

While it could be argued that *tinkerty-tonk* is merely a valedictory expression and thus a phatic exclamation, it seems to have an expressive side to it, at least if one puts confidence in Bertie Wooster's opinion:

- (8) 'Oh, for goodness' sake, go away and boil your head, Bertie!'

I drew myself up.

'That,' I replied, with dignity, 'is just what I am going to go away and boil. At least, I mean, I shall now leave you. I have said my say.'

'Good.'

'But permit me to add—'

'I won't.'

'Very good,' I said coldly. 'In that case, **tinkerty-tonk**.'

And I meant that to sting. (Right Ho, Jeeves, p. 229)

Granted, it isn't quite clear whether Bertie was aiming for a particular scathing farewell, or whether, on the contrary, he made use of the juxtapositive effect created by a cheery goodbye used in what could be taken to be a vitriolic manner. Either way, in this specific context it is undeniably expressive, and hence *tinkerty-tonk* will join the expressive group along with the phatic one.

Toodle-oo is simply used as a phrase of parting, and so it belongs only to the phatic category.

What ho, per contra, is much more protean than that. Its primary use seems to be reserved for a phrase of greeting, but it does have more to it than just that:

- (9) This row to which I refer was a kind of banging row, as if somebody were banging on something. And I had scarcely said to myself ‘**What ho**, a banger!’ when I saw who this banger was. It was Roderick Spode, and what he was banging on was the door of Gussie’s bedroom. (The Code of the Woosters, p. 212)

While the exclamation does not exactly mark a change in a discourse, as the utterance takes place in the thoughts of the narrator, its function here could very well be capable of doing so should the situation be a dialogue. Therefore, *what ho* is not without a metalinguistic aspect.

But the potentiality of the expression does not end there, as manifested by Bertie’s commentary on Archimedes:

- (10) I had accompanied him in spirit through all the subsequent formalities – the soaping of the loofah, the shampooing of the head, the burst of song... And then, abruptly, as he climbs towards the high note, there is a silence. His voice has died away. Through the streaming suds you can see that his eyes are glowing with a strange light. The loofah falls from his grasp, disregarded. He utters a triumphant cry. ‘Got it! **What ho**! The principle of displacement!’ (The Code of the Woosters, p. 214)

Here the expression is indicative of both a cognitive and an emotive realisation: Archimedes has made a discovery and he rejoices in it fully. It is apparent that *what ho* can also be categorised as an expressive interjection.

It was stated earlier that *coo* expresses surprise, and so it is more of a cognitive expression. But it has also emotive characteristics:

- (11) ‘What’s the idea? What do you mean, you repellent young boll weevil, by socking me with a dashed great club?’
 ‘It wasn’t a club. It was my Scout’s stick. Sort of like a hockey stick. Very useful.’
 ‘Comes in handy does it?’
 ‘Rather! Did it hurt?’
 ‘You may take it as definitely official that it hurt like blazes.’
 ‘**Coo!** I’m sorry. [...]’ (Joy in the Morning, p. 139)

In the example above, the exclamation does not only express surprise (because we're talking about an already-acknowledged assault) but remorse. Let's take a look at some other examples as well:

- (12) From somewhere above, a voice had spoken.
 'Coo!' it said. 'Who's there?'
 If it hadn't been for that 'Coo!' I might have supposed it the voice of Conscience. As it was, I was enabled to ticket it correctly as that of young blasted Edwin. (Joy in the Morning, p. 107)
- (13) 'So all he did was to tell me to go to bed.'
 'Then why aren't you in bed?'
 'Bed? Coo! Not likely. How's your head?' (Joy in the Morning, p. 140)
- (14) '[...] How's your head this morning, Bertie? I nearly forgot to ask.'
 'Still on the tender side.'
 'I thought it would be. Coo! That was funny last night, wasn't it? I laughed for hours, when I got to bed.' (Joy in the Morning, p. 172)

In the example (11), it is established that the exclamation is a trademark utterance of a character called Edwin. And he seems to take as much out of the expression as possible. In the same example, *coo* is used in a conative fashion: Edwin calls for the person he has detected and wants them to identify themselves. In the next two examples, upon continuing the saga of the aching head, one can see that the exclamation can be used in both evaluative and deontic ways respectively.

Golly and *egad* had both expressive and phatic qualities. The expressiveness is self-evidential, but the phatic side pertains to the fact that by using such expressive exclamations, the interlocutors can express their willingness to hear more of the topic at hand. Both exclamations could be used epistemically, deontically, and evaluatively.

In fine, here are the exclamations:

Exclamation	Type of interjection	Function	Instances
Bung-ho	Complex	Expressive / Phatic	1
By Jove	Secondary	Expressive / Phatic	7

Coo	Secondary	Expressive / Conative	10
Dash it	Secondary	Expressive / Metalinguistic	42
Egad	Primary	Expressive	10
Golly	Secondary	Expressive	19
Ho	Secondary	Conative / Expressive	6
Pip-pip	Complex	Phatic / Referential	5
Right-ho	Secondary	Expressive / Metalinguistic / Phatic	40
Tinkerty-tonk	Complex	Expressive / Phatic	2
Toodle-oo	Primary	Phatic	4
What ho	Secondary	Expressive / Metalinguistic / Phatic	26

Table 1. The exclamations.

Now it's time to move on to see what kind of translation strategies were chosen for these versatile linguistic items.

4.2 Translation strategies

Now I'm going to take a look at each strategy proposed by Cuenca, and how they were employed in the target texts. Some examples will be shown to justify the categorisation, and the results will be collected into a table at the end of the sub-chapter.

4.2.1 Literal translation

Upon dealing with linguistic elements which are highly embedded in a certain culture, it becomes clear that the literal translation strategy proposed by Cuenca can prove to be problematic. It is easy to point out if the exclamation *God* has been translated literally, but what about *golly*, *right ho*, or *dash it*?

Once again, the author of this thesis is going to exercise academic licence.

Sanakirja.org offers two different translations for *golly*: *jukra* and *juku*. If either one was used in the target texts, they will be considered literal translations. With *right ho*, the literal translation will be that of the translated title of *Right Ho, Jeeves: Jepulis, Jeeves*. The functions of the two exclamations could be seen to be similar regardless of the context, and they both have a brisk tone to them. The most frequent translation for *dash it* in the target texts was *piru vie* (18 instances), which seems to tally with the original meaning at least in terms of intensity and interjectional category: both are mild secondary interjections.

In the case of the other exclamations, such as *toodle-oo*, the translation strategy is labelled as literal if the form, function, and meaning correspond adequately.

Literal translation was applied fairly often in the translations: 49 instances out of 172 adhered to this strategy. In addition to the ones which were enumerated at the beginning of this sub-chapter, there were some more and some less obvious inclusions to this category:

(16) ‘**By Jove**, Jeeves, I believe you’re right.’ (The Code of the Woosters, p. 177)

– **Kautta Juppiterin**, Jeeves, taidatte olla oikeassa. (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 182)

Oxford Dictionaries bears out that Jove indeed is another name for Jupiter, and so, in spite of the additional letter p which has found its way into the translation, the target text exclamation corresponds to the original completely.

The following telegraphic example showcases a more original take on literal translation:

(17) *On consulting engagement book find it impossible come Brinkley Court. Deeply regret. **Toodle-oo**. Bertie.* (Right Ho, Jeeves, p. 62)

*Tutkin kalenteria. Mahdoton päästä lähtemään. Syvät pahoittelut. **Heipsundaa**. Bertie.* (Kiitos, Jeeves, p. 62)

The forms of the two exclamations correspond: they're both primary exclamations with a sing-songish feel to them. Their valedictory functions are identical and their semantic sides are sufficiently close to each other. Thus one can conclude that *heipsundaa* can be comfortably classified as a literal translation.

In the follow sub-chapters, it becomes clearer what kind of translations weren't accepted as literal. Towards the strategy B!

4.2.2 Translation by using an interjection with dissimilar form but the same meaning

A total of 42 translation were done using the strategy B. The instances wherein the aforementioned strategy was employed show how the translator has decided to go for more variety in the target texts, as demonstrated by the following examples:

- (18) 'I say to myself–
 'But not to me.'
 'Do listen for a second.'
 'I won't.'
 '**Right ho**, then. I am dumb.'
 'And have been from a child.' (Right Ho, Jeeves, p. 75)

- Mietin, että–
- Älä kerro.
- Kuuntele nyt hetki.
- Enkä kuuntele.
- **Selvä**. Olen aseeton.
- Niin olet ollut lapsesta asti. (Kiitos, Jeeves, p. 74)

- (19) '[...] Getting up on a platform and delivering a short, manly speech to a lot of foul school-kids! **Golly**, Jeeves. I've been through that sort of thing once, what? [...]' (Right Ho, Jeeves, p. 60-61)

[...] Nousta lavalle ja pitää napakka, miehekäs puhe laumalle sietämättömiä koululaisia! **Luojan pyssyt**, Jeeves. Olen kokenut sen jo kerran, vai mitä? [...]
 (Kiitos, Jeeves, p. 60)

- (20) '**By Jove**, Bertie, I don't know how to thank you.' (Right Ho, Jeeves, p. 56)
- **Taivaan vallat**, Bertie, en tiedä kuinka kiittäisin. (Kiitos, Jeeves, p. 56)

Each of the examples above already has an established equivalent to them, at least in some ways. The exclamations are nevertheless used similarly throughout the source texts, yet there seems to be some variation in their translations.

Instead of choosing one versatile exclamation, the translator has gone for a more pragmatic way in her translations. Here are two different examples of the versatile *what ho*:

(21) ‘**What ho!**’ said Gussie. ‘**What ho!** Hallo, Jeeves.’ (The Code of the Woosters, p. 110)

– **Hellurei!** Sanoi Gussie. – **Hellurei** ja tervehdys, Jeeves!’ (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 114)

(22) ‘**What ho**, Uncle Percy,’ I said. (Joy in the Morning, p. 222)

– **Tervehdys**, Percy-setä, sanoin. (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 535)

(23) ‘**What ho**, a banger!’ (The Code of the Woosters, p. 212)

“**Jaha**, joku paukuttaja” (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 217)

The second of these examples shows how the translator seems to favour an interpretative approach instead of turning the expression into a recurring item. Also, here one must once again point out the importance of the subjectivity of the issue: there might be some researchers who would label the translations of (21) and (22) as literal, based on the function. The view of the author of this thesis is, however, that the same translation should be prevalent in that case, and that it ought to be used in different functional contexts. Here, such is not the case, and later on it will become even clearer.

4.2.3 Translation by using a non-interjective structure with similar meaning

Deducing from the frequency of the instances where strategy C was implemented, that is, 5 out of 172, it becomes clear that the general trend in the translations was to

do interjections credit and replace them with their own kind. Here are some of the examples in which non-interjectional structures were used:

- (24) ‘Well, I wouldn’t for the world have you manhandled by that big stiff. You wouldn’t have a chance against a gorilla like that. He would tear the stuffing out of you before you could say “**Pip-pip**”. [...]’ (The Code of the Woosters, p. 121)

– No, en ikimailmassa suostu siihen, että tuo iso korsto sinua pahoinpitelee. Sinulla ei olisi mitään mahdollisuuksia mokomaa gorillaa vastaan. Hän kiskoisi sinusta täyteet ennen kuin ehtisit päästää **äänimerkin**. [...] (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 125)

- (25) ‘Still, there it is.’
 ‘Undoubtedly, sir.’
 ‘**Right ho**, then. Switch on the bath.’ (Right Ho, Jeeves, p. 65)

– Noh, näin se nyt on.
 – Näin se on.
 – **Näin siis sitten**. Voitte laittaa kylpyveden valumaan. (Kiitos, Jeeves, p. 64)

- (26) ‘**Right ho**, Uncle Percy’ (Joy in the Morning, p. 116)

– **Sopiihan se**, Percy-setä (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 418)

The first of these examples kind of corroborates the fact that there really isn’t an established equivalent to *pip-pip*. The exclamation is used in quotation marks in the original, yet in the target text it has been turned into a noun. Furthermore, there is no reference to the semantic features of the expression in the target text. However, that does by no means mean it is a bad translation – it merely focuses on other things than the source text.

In the second example, the exclamation has been replaced with a phrase wherein the copula verb has been omitted.

The last example is noteworthy in the sense that the interjection, which is considered a peripheral sentence class, is turned into a proper sentence. Arguably, both can be used in a similar manner, and indeed the tenor of the expressions is rather similar to the original exclamation, but the translation has both the subject and the predicate.

However, such translations were more of an anomaly than a conscious choice, given the frequency of the non-interjectional expressions. From the point of view of defining interjections, however, such instances can be extremely valuable. But as the

ad hoc definition of the concept has already been established, one needn't tarry with the topic any longer, and so one may move on to the next strategy.

4.2.4 Translation by using an interjection with a different meaning

Here's yet another strategy which was employed rather liberally: 40 instances could be found in the target texts. Even though each of the instances naturally diverged from the original meaning, there were different degrees in this difference. Some translations merely contracted the semantic scope of the original expression, whereas other translations would go as far as to alter the meaning altogether. Let's have a look at the former:

- (27) 'How do you do?' said Stinker.
 'How do you do, sir?' said Jeeves.
 We climbed down, and I came forward with outstretched hand, anxious to get the reunion going.
 '**What ho**, Stinker.'
 'Hullo, Bertie.' (The Code of the Woosters, p. 172)

– Päivää, sanoi Pimeä.
 – Hyvää päivää, sanoi Jeeves.
 Kipusimme alas ja astuin esiin kättäni ojentaen innokkaana aloittamaan jälleennäkemisen.
 – **Kas**, mitä Pimeä?
 – Terve, Bertie. (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 177)

- (28) [...] when I went in and saw Madeline Basset seated at the piano, drooping on her stem a goodish deal, the sight nearly caused me to turn and leg it. However, I fought down the impulse and started things off with a tentative '**What ho**.' (The Code of the Woosters, p. 205)

[...] kun sisään astuttuani näin Madeline Bassettin nuopahtaneen hahmon pianon ääressä, piti läheltä, etten pötkinyt saman tien pakoon. Kamppailin kuitenkin virikettä vastaan ja totesin sen sijaan aloitukseksi: "**Jaaha**." (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 210)

- (29) 'You don't mean that?'
 'I do.'
 '**Egad!**' I said.
 For this was serious. (Joy in the Morning, p. 42)

– Ei voi olla totta.
 – On se.
 – **Harmin paikka!** sanoin.
 Tämä oli nähkääs vakavaa. (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 341)

In (27), there has been a very minor alteration, yet the meanings of the two exclamations don't match completely. In this instance, *what ho* is a greeting, first and

foremost, whereas in the target text, the expression is more like an acknowledgment of the presence of the other interlocutor. *Kas, mitä* seems to act in the capacity of a *how-do-you-do* in this particular case, as opposed to a hearty *what ho*.

The following example shows yet another instance of how that particular expression can be interpreted differently. The context makes it clear enough that the original expression is used as a greeting, yet *jaaha* is more of a discourse marker in this case. At least it's very difficult to conceive *jaaha* a greeting.

Another interesting decision has been taken in (29), where the exclamation of dismay, and presumably panic, has been translated into an expression of commiseration.

However, there are examples which are less equivocal:

- (30) 'And, sure enough, from somewhere to the nor'-nor'-east there came the sound of some solid object shuffling through the night.
I inhaled in quick concern.
'**Egad**, Jeeves!'
'Sir?'
''Tis he!'
'Yes, sir.'
I mused a moment.
'Well,' I said, though not liking the prospect and wishing that the civility could have been avoided, 'I suppose I'd better pass the time of day. **What ho**,' I continued, as he came abreast. '**What ho, what ho!**' (Joy in the Morning, p. 115)

Toden totta, jostakin pohjoisen ja koillisen välistä kuului yössä liikkuvan isokokoisen elävän kahinaa.
Vetäisin henkeä äkkiä hermostuen.
– **Apua**, Jeeves!
– Anteeksi?
– Se on hän!
– Kyllä on.
Mietin hetkosen.
– No jaa, sanoin, vaikka en pitänyt näkymästä ja toivoin, että tervehtimiset olisi voinut laistaa. – Kaipa minun on parasta sanoa reippaasti päivää. – **Jahas**, jatkoin tulijan tullessa liki. – **Jahas, kas kas!** (Hiip, Jeeves, p. 417)

- (31) The first thing he did on entering the room was to give me one of those looks of his, and it chilled my insides like a quart of ice cream. I
I had a shot at an airy 'Ah, there you are, Stilton,' but my heart was not in it, and it elicited no response except a short '**Ho!**' (Joy in the Morning, p. 254)

Ensi töikseen huoneeseen astuttuaan Stiltonin sinkosi minuun yhden ominaiskatseistaan, ja se kylmäsi sisäkalujani kuin yliannos jäätelöä. Yritin lausahtaa kepeän huolettomasti "Kas, sinähän se siinä, Stilton",

mutta sydämeni ei ollut mukana, eikä se saanut muuta responsia kuin
“Stop!” (Hiip, Jeeves, p. 569)

- (32) ‘So all he did was to tell me to go to bed.’
 ‘Then why aren’t you in bed?’
 ‘Bed? **Coo!** Not likely. How’s your head?’ (Joy in the Morning, p. 140)

– Joten isä ei tehnyt muuta kuin käski mennä sänkyyn.
 – Mikset mennyt?
 – Sänkyyn? **Äää!** Ei aikeita. Miltä pää tuntuu? (Hiip, Jeeves, p. 445)

- (33) ‘Oh that?’ I said. ‘Yes, that was a Grade A act of kindness.’
 ‘I know. But do you think it still counts?’
 ‘Oh, rather.’
 ‘In spite of my socking you?’
 ‘Unquestionably!’
 ‘**Coo!** Then I’m all square up to last Thursday!’ (Joy in the Morning, p. 143)

– Ai sitä? sanoin. – Se oli tosiaan kymppin arvoinen hyvä teko.
 – Tiedän. Mutta lasketaanko se vielä mukaan?
 – Aivan takuulla.
 – Vaikka annoin sinulle tällin?
 – Ehdottomasti.
 – **Äää!** Siinä tapauksessa viime torstaihin asti on puissa.
 (Hiip, Jeeves, p. 449)

The example (30) showcases a triple implementation of the strategy D. First there’s an exclamation of surprise turned into an entreaty for help. Secondly, there’s a *what ho* the greeting turned into a *what ho* the acknowledging element, translated in two different ways.

The translator has come upon a very interesting decision when it comes to the example (31). According to *Oxford Dictionaries*, *ho* can be used to express expression of surprise, admiration, triumph, or derision or it can be used to call for attention. *Stop*, on the other hand, carries very different semantic meaning in it, so the decision is very fascinating, to say the least.

In (32) and (33) it can be seen that, despite the slightly different usage of the exclamation in the source text, the translator has decided to stick with a fixed translation for *coo*. *Äää* could be said to be rather ambiguous, and one would be hard-pressed to actually find a proper definition for such an utterance, but it still has something panicky about it. Hence it doesn’t exactly correspond to the *coos* shown above: The first one seems to express incredulity or derision towards the question of the interlocutor, and the second one would appear to be an exclamation of relief or joy.

While the speculation of the rationale of such strategies isn't the focal point of this thesis, such decisions are extremely interesting in terms of the possible reasons the translators might have for translating something as pragmatic as interjections. They would not only shed light on how translators perceive certain sections in texts, but they could also explain how translators interpret certain ambiguities of expression. However, that is merely food for thought, and it is time for the study of the next strategy.

4.2.5 Omission

Omission wasn't exactly what one might term a preponderant strategy: it was used only 11 times. The following examples testify to its implementation:

- (34) 'Yes, I heard what you said, all right, but not what you were going to say.'
 'Oh, I see.'
 '**Right-ho.**'
 So that was straightened out. (Right Ho, Jeeves, p. 282)

– Kuulin kyllä mitä sanoit, mutta en mitä aioit sanoa.
 – Aa, ahaa.
 Se selvitti sen. (Kiitos, Jeeves, p. 281)

- (35) 'Bertie, dear.'
 'But, **dash it** –'
 'Bertie, darling.'
 'Yes, but **dash it** –'
 'Bertie, my sweet.'
 And so it was arranged. (Right Ho, Jeeves, p. 272)

– Bertie, kultaseni,
 – Niin mutta pirulauta –
 – Bertie, aarteeni.
 Niin sitten sovittiin. (Kiitos, Jeeves, p. 217)

- (36) '[...] I shall stamp it out, root and branch, and see to it that the liberty of the subject is not placed in jeopardy by officers of the Law who so far forget their—yes, **dash it**, their sacred obligations as to bring trumped-up charges right and left in a selfish desire to secure promotion. [...]' (Joy in the Morning, p. 257–258)

Rusennan trendin jalkoihini juurineen ja oksineen pitääkseni huolen siitä, että yksilön vapaus ei joudu vaaraan sen takia, että lain edustajat – en kaihda sanoa pyhän velvollisuutensa unohtaen – tehtailevat syytteitä oikealle ja vasemmalle itsekkäässä halussaan saada urallaan ylennys. (Hiip, Jeeves, p. 573)

(37) ‘Ten shillings, eh? Supper, **egad**? Warm bed, forsooth? [...]’ (Joy in the Morning, p. 125)

– Vai kymmenen sillinkiä. Iltapala. Ja lämmin vuode, luojaan pyssyt! [...] (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 428)

It could be argued, that the exclamations were left out because they were not deemed essential in these particular contexts, like in (34), wherein the narrative sentence following the dialogue already signals assent, or in (35), wherein the gist of the conversation could be understood without the last two lines. It could also be that the retention of the exclamation in some cases might be perceived to be detrimental to the flow of the translation, like in the following two examples. Once again, it’s a case of extremely delicate yet still meaningful translatorial decisions.

4.2.6 Addition of elements

The last of the strategies garnered 25 instances of employment. Here, such exclamations were included, which had clearly something extra in them, and thus uncommon expressions such as *jukupliuta* and *pirulauta* were included, yet phrases like *sopiihan se* were excluded. The first two examples have an additional suffix appended to them, which can also affect the tone of the expression. *Sopiihan se* could be said to include extra elements if the phrase is compared to the expression *sopii*, yet the author of this thesis is afraid it would be taking the definition of this strategy too far.

Here are some demonstrating examples:

(38) ‘But, **dash it!**’ (The Code of the Woosters, p. 37)

– Ei **pirulauta!** (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 39)

(39) ‘There was a story in it last week about a Duke who wouldn’t let his daughter marry the young secretary, so the secretary got a friend of his to take the Duke out on the lake and upset the boat, and then he dived in and saved the Duke, and the Duke said “**Right ho**”.’ (The Code of the Woosters, p. 96)

– Siinä oli viime viikolla juttu jostakin herttuasta, joka ei halunnut antaa tyttärensä naida hänen nuorta sihteeriään, minkä jälkeen sihteeri värväsi ystävänsä viemään herttuan järvelle soutelemaan ja järjestämään niin, että vene kaatui. Sen jälkeen sihteeri sukelsi veteen pelastamaan herttuan, ja herttua sanoi “**Jo sopii!**” (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 99)

(40) ‘Well, **pip-pip**,’ I said, changing the subject, and withdrew. (Joy in the Morning, p. 25)

– No jaa, **heippurei nyt sitten**, sanoin vaihtaen puheenaihetta ja poistuen tilanteesta. (Hiip, Jeeves, p. 322)

(41) ‘**Golly**, Uncle Percy,’ she said, a womanly pity in her voice that became her well. (Joy in the Morning, p. 249-250)

– **Voi jukra**, Percy-setä, hän sanoi äänessään naisellista sääliä, joka puki häntä. (Hiip, Jeeves, p. 564)

In (39), the translator has added the particle *jo* to underscore the sense of agreement. A lengthier addition was included in the second example, where the particles can be taken to colour the mood of the interlocutor. The last example is yet another instance of an intensifying particle appended to the more common exclamation *jukra*.

This concludes the analysis of the translation strategies utilised in the target texts.

The instances of each can be seen in the following table:

A	B	C	D	E	F
Literal translation	Dissimilar interjection with similar meaning	Non-interjectional structure with similar meaning	Interjection with different meaning	Omission	Addition of elements
49	42	5	40	11	25

Table 2. The instances of translation strategies employed in the target texts.

Now, to recapitulate the results: the most common strategies appear to be literal translation (A), translation by using an interjection with dissimilar form but the same meaning (B), and translation by using an interjection with a different meaning (D). Translation by using a non-interjectional structure with similar meaning (C) and omission (E) were implemented relatively sparsely, and even the addition of elements (F) was used half as little as the three most popular ones.

At this point it should be said, that the author of this thesis doesn't actually posit his whole thesis on the assumption that the translator has been perfectly aware of the strategies they employed during the translation process. The statistics here are merely observations, and not indicators of the conscious processing of interjections. The purpose of these figures is merely to raise awareness of the less conspicuous levels of translation and to offer insights into the possibilities a translator can choose to avail themselves of, not to enable rash conclusions.

And so it is time to enter the last phase of the analysis: the categorial matters.

4.3 Changes in category and function

This sub-chapter is reserved for the analysis of the effects of the translations on the interjectional categories and functions. Firstly, I will take a look at what kind of changes were done to the interjectional categories, and what was retained. The retention is included here in order to make the research more transparent, but also to demonstrate the unity (or the lack thereof) of the translator's choice of equivalents. Secondly, I will conduct an analysis on the functional matters.

4.3.1 Categorial changes

If one takes a careful look at the strategical arsenal delineated above, one will indubitably come to the conclusion that half of the strategies cannot be employed in the categorial analysis because those translations either aren't interjections or cannot be classified to a single category. This results in the dismissal of C, E, and F for the duration of this sub-sub-chapter.

72 exclamations out of the remaining 130 have undergone a categorial change, the figures whereof can be seen in the table below. The bolding indicates that a categorial shift or retention took place in every translation of the bolded exclamation.

Exclamation	Type of interjection	Categorial change	No change
Bung-ho	Complex	-	1
By Jove	Secondary	-	7

Coo	Secondary	10	-
Dash it	Secondary	-	21
Egad	Primary	4	4
Golly	Secondary	7	7
Ho	Secondary	-	6
Pip-pip	Complex	2	-
Right-ho	Secondary	24	11
Tinkerty-tonk	Complex	2	-
Toodle-oo	Primary	4	-
What ho	Secondary	14	6

Table 3. The categories according to type.

Before moving on, one thing ought to be made clear: In connection with the figures above, the question of consistency will inevitably rise as one of the main themes of this sub-sub-chapter. In this particular context, that is, categorial changes and retention, the term consistency is used to refer to translation strategies which have clearly favoured either change or retention, and which conspicuously show a penchant for a particular categorial change (for example, changing the category from complex to primary).

Overall, there were six exclamations which were translated so that a categorial shift or retention took place in every instance: *bung-ho*, *by Jove*, *coo*, *ho*, *tinkerty-tonk*, and *toodle-oo*. And as it happens, each of the above-mentioned items was also assigned to one margin only. While in the case of such sparse exclamations as *bung-ho* and *tinkerty-tonk* the shift or retention may be merely arbitrary, some of the more

frequent items adumbrate something of a conscious effort. The translations of *coo* and *ho* were respectively invariable throughout the texts, and hence the categorial statuses also remained similar in every instance. With *by Jove*, there were two different variants of the translation (*kautta Juppiterin* and *taivaan vallat*), yet the categorial status of every exclamation remained the same.

While it would be needlessly cumbersome to go through all the different statistics of the nature of the categorial change of each instance, a closer look could be taken on the bolded exclamations and the two most prevalent exclamations, *right ho* and *what ho*, just to give the reader a better idea of the implications. According to the table above, there was one primary exclamation (*toodle-oo*), three secondary exclamations (*by Jove*, *ho*, and *coo*), and two complex exclamations (*bung-ho* and *tinkerty-tonk*) among the categorially biased batch.

Three different translations were chosen for *toodle-oo*: *heippa*, *heippurei*, and *heipsundaa*. Because each of these translations is based on the exclamation *hei* with an extra suffix appended to them, they are all to be classified as complex interjections. Therefore, all the translations of this exclamation have been uniform in categorial regard.

Moving on to the secondary triad, first there's *by Jove* and its two different translations mentioned a couple of paragraphs ago. Both translations consist of morphemes which belong to other word classes semantically speaking, and hence their status remains as secondary interjections. The same thing applies to *ho*: It was translated only as *stop*, and because the word can also be used to refer to a traffic sign, it ought to be considered secondary. The final exclamation, *coo*, was also translated *äää* throughout the source text it appeared in, which means that its interjectional category was degraded to primary.

The consistency of *bung-ho* is self-evident, yet that of *tinkerty-tonk* isn't. The exclamation was translated as *hilipati hei* and *trilla lalla* – in other words, first as a secondary then as a primary interjection. Thus, *tinkerty-tonk* marks the only bolded interjection which wasn't completely consistent in its approach, because the shifts were of a different nature.

But let's take a look at a more abundant example: *right ho*. The retentive translations of the former formed a somewhat noticeable pattern: there were five instances of *selvä*, a *jo vain* trinity, a brace of *hienoa*s and a solitary *antaa olla*. The pattern is further strengthened by the fact that the five and three respective translations above were employed in succession, the *hienoa* clan and the lonely *antaa olla* separating the two schools of equivalents.

Shift-wise, there was a blatantly lopsided ratio of primary and complex interjections, for there were only three of the former (*ahaa*, *joo joo*, and *jeh*). While this doesn't imply any kind of pattern whatsoever, the exclamations classified as complex interjections were conspicuously unified: all of the instances were translated as *jepulis*. (It is exactly choices like the employment of the three primary outliers above to which it would be very interesting to find an answer, because the persistent use of the translation *jepulis* is indicative of something more than just a random approach to interjectional translation.)

As opposed to the detectable continuity in the strategies used with *right ho*, *what ho* departs from the perceptible steadiness. When it comes to the retention of the interjectional category, there isn't, strictly speaking, a single repeated item among the translations: *piru vie*, *tervehdys*, *mitä mies*, *mitäs mies*, *mitäs täs*, and *kas vain*. If one takes a look at the changes, there are four instances of complex interjections and 10 of primary ones. The former comprised *hellurei*, *hellurei*, *morjensta*, and *hoijaa*, while the latter had the following exclamations: *kas*, *jaaha*, *jaha*, *jahas*, *jahas*, *kas*, *hih hei*, *hih hei*, *hih hei* and another *hih hei*. This time there is more commonality within the two classes, but the consistency isn't quite as prominent as in the case of, say, *right ho*. However, if one adapted a less rigorous slant towards the translations presented above, it could be argued that it's indeed the strictness of the categorisation which undermines the consistency of the translations above, not the choices of the translator. This view is not something that the author of this thesis is going to adapt, but it should be taken into account at all events.

So, keeping the example of *what ho* in mind, it doesn't bode well for anyone wishing to form generalisations based on the evidence. Then again, such variety is clearly anomalous in reference to the instances investigated so far, which means that it could be considered more of an exception. As a result, it could be said that, categorisation-

wise, the translations presented above were more or less consistent in their approach. This is true even statistically speaking: if we ignore some of the less numerous examples such as *bung-ho*, only two exclamations were notably inconsistent as regards the change or retention of the interjectional category, viz. *egad* and *golly*. But how about the unity of their translations?

The translator has favoured a consistent approach to the retention of *egad*'s interjectional category throughout the texts. Out of the four instances shown in the table above, each of them has been translated as *jösses*. Interestingly enough, the situation is flipped topsy-turvy if one takes a look at the changed elements: there are four completely different translations (*harmin paikka*, *kas vain*, *apua*, *taivas*). This time, there isn't any marked continuity in the employment of the above-mentioned translations, which seems to hint towards the pursuit of variation. Be that as it may, *egad* could be said to be one of the more unified entries in the table.

The following translations of *golly* occasioned no categorial change: *luojan pyssyt*, *voi tavaton*, *taivas*, *luojan pyssyt*, *voi jumbe*, *luojan pyssyt*, and *luojan pieksut*. Once again, strictly speaking, there isn't much unity here, apart from the three instances of *luojan pyssyt*. (As an aside, however, most of the items above seem to have a divine or empyrean theme to them, which means that they should not be scolded for a complete lack of unity.) Finally, the chronological list of the changers are as follows: *jukra*, *jukra*, *jukra*, *jukra*, *jösses*, *hiivatti*, and *jesses*. Here one begins to see some traces of continuity with *jukra*, but ultimately the translator has decided to try out something different. So, at the end of the day, *golly* isn't quite as unified as most of the examples seen above, even though there are traces of continuity in both the change and retention sectors.

In fine, if one looks at the exclamations from the sole perspective of categorial change, the translator has been fairly consistent in her approach. However, if one takes the used equivalents into consideration, it becomes clear that there's great variety to be seen. And, using that as a transition, it's now time to dive further into the niceties of interjections by taking a look at what kind of functional repercussions the translator's choice of equivalents might have.

4.3.2 Functional changes

In the section above, the aspect of retention was investigated, because by showing what passes as a categorial shift and what doesn't, the reader gets a better idea of the rationale of the research. However, demonstrating functional retention would be an all-too laborious and ultimately fruitless endeavour: making generalisations out of something as context-bound as interjectional functions would, by definition, be futile. Hence this section will only focus on actual changes brought about by the translations.

But one might, quite rightly, press the author on the subject of 'functional change': what qualifies as change? The simple answer would be: everything that causes the translated exclamation to differ from the original in terms of function. The changes can be less overt than a change in the main function (e.g. an expressive interjection would turn into a phatic one). If the translated item would, for example, have an added epistemic quality to it, the exclamation would make its way to the change category. Or if the translation lacked a deontic dimension, it would be deposited to the same column. Likewise, if the original exclamation and its translation were both expressive interjections, yet the other would be cognitive and the other emotive, this would also constitute a functional change.

Once again, the notion of consistency will inevitably arise in this section. However, this time around the term will only be used to describe a disproportionate distribution between functional change and retention. A more exhaustive definition of the term would be very difficult to establish, since there are simply too many ways for an interjection to undergo functional change.

Like in the previous sub-sub-chapter, I have compiled all the qualified items in the table below. Obviously, omissions had to be omitted from this particular bit of the research, but everything else was included. The bolding indicates that a functional shift or retention took place in every translation of the bolded exclamation.

Exclamation	Function	Functional change	No change
Bung-ho	Expressive / Phatic	-	1

By Jove	Expressive / Phatic	-	7
Coo	Expressive / Conative	-	10
Dash it	Expressive / Metalinguistic	3	33
Egad	Expressive	2	6
Golly	Expressive	-	19
Ho	Conative / Expressive	6	-
Pip-pip	Phatic / Referential	5	-
Right-ho	Expressive / Metalinguistic / Phatic	7	32
Tinkerty-tonk	Expressive / Phatic	1	1
Toodle-oo	Phatic	-	4
What ho	Expressive / Metalinguistic / Phatic	16	10

Table 4. The categories according to function.

Here the total number of exclamations amounts to 163, and a functional change occurred in 41 instances. This shows that even though there were plenty of translations which had a different meaning from the original, and even though more than half of the eligible exclamations in the previous sub-sub-chapter were of different category, the translations were on the whole pretty close to the originals in

practice. Furthermore, the figures also show that the translator has had a fairly consistent approach towards interjections, functionally speaking. Apart from *tinkerty-tonk* and *what ho*, each of the bolded exclamations have either been completely changed, or they have undergone no change at all. And when observing the numbers en masse, one can see that those two exclamations are essentially aberrations.

There are seven different exclamations to study at this point: *dash it*, *egad*, *ho*, *pip-pip*, *right ho*, *tinkerty-tonk*, and *what ho*. Since the instances of *dash it*, *egad*, and *tinkerty-tonk* were so exiguous, they will be examined thoroughly. The other exclamations will be studied by using a few selected examples.

Let's begin with *dash it*:

- (42) 'But how am I to get it?'
 A slight smile curved the young pimple's mobile lips.
 'Oh, **dash it**, use your own judgement,' she said. (The Code of the Woosters, p. 203)
- Mutta miten minä sen sieltä saan käsiini?
 Hymy nousi karehtimaan hempukan huulille.
 – Päätä **piru vie** itse, hän sanoi. (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 209)
- (43) 'But, **dash it**, what is all this? How do you mean, a job? Why a job?
 What sort of job? (Right Ho, Jeeves, p. 42)
- Mutta mistä **pirulauta** on kysymys? Mitä tarkoittaa töitä? Mitä töitä?
 Miksi töitä? (Kiitos, Jeeves, p. 41)
- (44) 'Oh, **dash it**, old man, nothing? You were a bit tactless, what, about her shark.' (Right Ho, Jeeves, p. 124)
- Hei, mies, **piru vie**, kuinka niin tyhjästä? Sinä olit tahditon siinä haiasiassa. (Kiitos, Jeeves, p. 123)

The expressiveness has been retained in all of the examples above, but it's the metalinguistic aspect that doesn't seem to manifest itself in the translations. Some other researcher could easily dismiss these claims by stating that the expression is used purely expressively in the source texts, while exclamations like *oh* and *but* handle the meta matters. However, if one takes a look at the examples of metalinguistic interjections proffered by Matamala (2009: 488), we get such items as *look*, *well* and *listen*. In my opinion, the exclamation *look* could easily replace both *ohs*, *buts*, and *dash its*, because it can still have its expressive function, depending on

the context. The other fact which supports this metalinguistic theorem is that the expression seems to be in frequent use of the characters in the story, and hence it has become something a bit more conventional than a mere expressive (cf. *look* being something more than just an imperative expression, entreating the interlocutor to cast their eyes on something).

If one accepts this viewpoint, then it could be said that the three translations don't follow this trend, mainly because the lines don't begin with the expressions. Rather, the translated exclamations have been placed clearly further away from the beginning of the sentence than in the originals. But this doesn't mean that other translations didn't emphasise the metalinguistic qualities of *dash it* – that was perpetrated merely by these three mavericks. Here are two examples showcasing proper retention of the metalinguistic functions of *dash it*:

- (45) 'But, **dash it**, Gussie. In these romantic surroundings, I should have thought the whispering trees alone –' (Right Ho, Jeeves, p. 103)

– **Piru vie**, Gussie. Näissä romanttisissa maisemissa. Olisin luullut, että yksistään puiden kuiske – (Kiitos, Jeeves, p. 102)

- (46) '**Dash it**, there are hundreds of things you can say. Talk about the sunset.' (Right Ho, Jeeves, p. 105)

– **Pirulauta**, onhan niitä puheenaiheita vaikka millä mitalla. Puhu vaikka auringonlaskusta. (Kiitos, Jeeves, p. 104)

The first of these shows that the translation is actually more conspicuously metalinguistic. In the second example, the functions of the exclamations are identical.

Next in line, there's the ever-expressive *egad*.

- (47) '... What I would suggest is that Mr Fink-Nottle should inform the officer that he has seen his helmet in your possession.'

'**Egad**, Jeeves!'

'Yes, sir.'

'I see the idea. Yes, very hot. Yes, that would do it.' (The Code of the Woosters, p. 227)

–... Itse ehdottaisin, että jospa herra Fink-Nottle vasikoisi poliisimiehelle nähneensä tämän kypärän teidän hallussanne.

– **Hyvä**, Jeeves!

– Kiitos.

– Tajuan idean. Tosi hyvää tavaraa. Takuulla toimii. (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 232)

- (48) '... Suppose, I said to myself, I were to save the heavy's home from being looted by a midnight marauder, that would make him feel I had the right stuff

in me, I fancy. He would say “**Egad!** A fine young fellow, this Fittleworth!” would he not?’ (Joy in the Morning, p. 99)

—... Oletetaanpa, sanoin itselleni, että pelastan tuon ison miehen kodin joutumasta keskiyöllä vaanivan varkaan ryöstämäksi. Silloin hän ajattelisi, että minussa on ainesta. Hän sanoisi “**Kas vain!** Kelpo nuori mies to Fittleworth!” Eikö vain? (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 400)

In the first of the two examples, there are two things that are changed in the translation. First of all, the target text item lacks the cognitive aspect of the original. *Egad* is clearly used both emotively (showing how affected the interlocutor is by Jeeves’s stratagem) and cognitively (showing that the interlocutor realises the efficacy of the stratagem), whereas *hyvä* only seems as an emotive compliment. Moreover, the translation is evaluatively different from the original: *hyvä* intimates that the interlocutor approves of Jeeves’s suggestion, while *egad* is more of an awed response.

In (48), the emotive side of the translation seems to be conspicuous by its absence. The expression seems to be used only in the cognitive sense, showing how the interlocutor realises the merit of Fittleworth. Furthermore, the source text exclamation also seems to have a deontic quality to it, demonstrating assent towards Fittleworth’s actions. However, the translation is more ambiguous in that regard – by the looks of it, *kas vain* is more of an evaluative statement which shows that the interlocutor is positively, albeit slightly, surprised at the turn of events.

Therefore, even though the major function of an interjection may be the same, there can still be meaningful disparities between the original and the translation. But how are things with *ho*?

- (49) Boko, who is always a perfect host, bade the newcomer a cheery good morning, and asked him to keep his mouth open and he would throw a sardine into it. But apparently the latter had already breakfasted, for he declined the invitation with a petulant jerk of the head.
‘**Ho!**’ he said. (Joy in the Morning, p. 234)

Boko, joka on aina täydellinen isäntä, toivotti tulijalle iloisesti hyvää huomenta ja käski tätä pitämään suutaan auki, niin hän heittäisi siihen sardiinin. Ilmeisesti tulija oli kuitenkin jo syönyt aamiaisensa, sillä hän torjui ehdotuksen viskaamalla äkäisesti päätään.
– **Stop!** hän sanoi. (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 549)

- (50) I had a shot at an airy ‘Ah, there you are, Stilton,’ but my heart was not in it, and it elicited no response except a short ‘**Ho!**’ (Joy in the Morning, p. 254)

Yritin lausahtaa kepeän huolettomasti “Kas, sinähän se siinä, Stilton”, mutta sydämeni ei ollut mukana, eikä se saanut muuta responsia kuin “**Stop!**” (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 569)

By consulting the table above, it can be seen that each of the instances of *ho* have consistently changed the function of the original expression. Looking at the two examples above, what strikes the eye is the lack of expressiveness of the translation. The same phenomenon was apparent in every translation of the expression, so any example would've served as good a purpose as the ones above. The exclamation *stop* is merely a conative, and hence it also lacks the evaluative qualities of the original. However, it seems to add a deontic element to the text – in (49), the interlocutor makes his dissent towards the perfect host's greeting ceremony well-known to the public. There's a similar kind of change in (50).

Pip pip was yet another consistent exclamation which left nothing but functional alterations in its wake. It's a unique item in this research in the sense that it's the sole referential exclamation of the original lot, and therein lies the root of the change, too. The following example is representative of every translation of *pip pip*:

(51) ‘Well, **pip-pip**,’ I said, changing the subject, and withdrew. (Joy in the Morning, p. 25)

– No jaa, **heippurei nyt sitten**, sanoin vaihtaen puheenaihetta ja poistuen tilanteesta. (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 322)

None of the translations employed an onomatopoeic equivalent, and hence there was a functional change in each instance by definition. The translation clearly aimed for some kind of stylistic equivalent, though, yet it's based on the common Finnish greeting *hei*. The phatic quality was retained in each of the translations, however.

Let's take a look at the more multi-faceted *right ho* now by focusing on four different examples.

(52) ‘Just one moment, Stilton. Sorry to interrupt, but do we bandy a woman's name?’
‘Yes, we do, and ruddy well keep on bandying it.’
‘Oh, **right ho**. I just wanted to know.’ (Joy in the Morning, p. 60)

– Hetkinen, Stilton. Anteeksi että keskeytän, mutta emme kai levittele naisen nimeä?

– Takuulla levittelemme.

– Aa, **ahaa**. Halusin vain tarkistaa. (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 361)

In this example, *right ho* clearly has an epistemic side to it, because the interlocutor poses a question to Stilton, thus seeking to validate the veracity of his statement. However, there is no such thing apparent in the translation. *Ahaa* doesn't exactly indicate the interlocutor's stance on the veracity, it merely shows that the interlocutor has registered the answer. Otherwise the translation corresponds to the functions of the original.

- (53) 'Don't call me "old man"'
- '**Right ho**, if you don't like it. ...' (Joy in the Morning, p. 62)
- Älä kutsu minua vanhaksi veikoksi.
- **Selvä**. En, jos et halua. ... (Hiip, Jeeves, p. 363)

Here's a case of yet another slightly ambiguous metalinguistic disparity. It still seems to be clear that *right ho* indeed does act as a discourse marker as well as an expression of assent. However, the exclamation in the target text seems to be only used to indicate assent.

- (54) '... He would agree, and then he would glance at the portrait of her ladyship which hangs above the study door and demur once more. Left to himself, without constant exhortation and encouragement, I fear he might yet change his mind.'
- 'Something in that, Jeeves. A bit jumpy, is he?'
- 'Extremely so, sir.'
- I could not blame the old bird. I have already described my own emotions on catching the eye of that portrait of Aunt Agatha.
- '**Right ho**, Jeeves.' (Joy in the Morning, p. 202)
- ... Hän välillä jo suostui, mutta katsoi sen jälkeen arvon ladin muotokuva työhuneensa oven yläpuolella ja tahtoi jälleen pyörtää. Yksin jätettynä vailla jatkuvaa lietsontaa ja kannustusta on olemassa vaara, että hän muuttaa vielä mielensä.
- Tuossa on perää, Jeeves. Taitaa mies olla peloissaan.
- Sangen.
- En voinut moittia Percy-setää. Olen jo kuvannut oman tuntemukseni, kun Agatha-tädin muotokuva sai minut näköpiiriinsä.
- **Olkoon menneeksi**, Jeeves. (Hiip, Jeeves, p. 513)

On a cursory look, there doesn't seem to be any kind of alteration in the translation, not in terms of main functions at least. Once again, it's the micro-level functions which cause the change. *Olkoon menneeksi* has a different tone to it, because it also denotes resignation, in addition to the assent of the original exclamation. It's true, that *right ho* could be used in this sense too, but it's not apparent enough in the source text. To put it in linguistic terms, *olkoon menneeksi* and *right ho* are evaluatively different. The former indicates that the interlocutor is somewhat loath to

concede to the proposal, yet the latter merely expresses that the interlocutor is in favour of the delineated scheme.

Here's the final example:

(55) 'Impossible,' she repeated.

I had been so busy feeling saved from the scaffold that I didn't get on it for a moment that an early reply was desired.

'Oh, **right ho**,' I said hastily. (Right Ho, Jeeves, p. 116)

– Mahdotonta, hän toisti.

Olin ollut niin huojentunut pelastuttuani hirsipuusta, etten aivan heti tajunnut, että minulta odotettiin vastarepliikkiä.

– Aa, **hienoa, hienoa**, sanoin häthätää. (Kiitos, Jeeves, p. 115)

And what a fine specimen it is! In this instance, there are four different ways in which the translation has changed the function of the original. First of all, the translation, unlike the original, is an emotive exclamation. There is nothing in the original *right ho* to showcase an imbued emotion – au contraire, the reply is categorically used out of the sense of social obligation. In the target text, the exclamation isn't used in a very heartfelt manner either, but it is conspicuously conveying an emotional reaction.

Secondly, the translation lacks a clear cognitive element. If one were to paraphrase *hienoa, hienoa*, the result would be something like "I am pleased to hear that this is impossible." Whereas if one were to put *right ho* in other words, the result would be "I acknowledge that this is impossible, and I will accede to it." And if closer scrutiny is applied to the paraphrases above, the third functional divergence comes to light: The translation doesn't have an epistemic side to it. And fourthly, there's a difference in the evaluative aspects of the two exclamations. While the original merely acknowledges, the translation makes it known that the interlocutor shows a propensity for the status quo.

All in all, most of the translations *right ho* changed the function of the exclamation in the micro-level. Macro changes, like the one showcased in (53), were relatively rare.

Next up: *tinkerty tonk*.

(56) 'Very good,' I said coldly. 'In that case, **tinkerty-tonk**.'

And I meant that to sting. (Right Ho, Jeeves, p. 229)

– Olkoon sitten, sanoin kylmästi. – Ei sitten muuta kuin **trilla lalla**. Ja tarkoitus oli, että se sattuisi. (Kiitos, Jeeves, p. 228)

Interestingly enough, here a reverse case of the *pip pip* incident seems to have taken place. The translator has added a referential element to the translation, and thus changing its main functional category. It is a moot point whether *trilla lalla* could be construed as a valedictory (whereas *tinkerty-tonk* has been somewhat established as such), but the author of this thesis is inclined to be lenient at this point, and would like to defer to pragmatics: the context makes it understandable enough that the expression is used as a farewell.

Speaking of which, it's time for the last item in the list: *what ho*. There's a total of 16 instances of functional change in the translations of this particular expression, and the examples have been carefully cherry-picked to reflect the overall approach in translating the exclamation.

(57) '**What ho**, Stiffy.'

'Hullo.'

'Nice evening. Your dog's just been sick on the carpet.' (The Code of the Woosters, p. 165)

– **Jaha, kas**, Stiffy.

– Terve.

– Hieno ilta. Hauvelisi oksensi juuri matolle. (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 170)

One of the common strategies was to replace the phatic original exclamation with something more cognitive, sometimes forgoing the phatic element altogether. This is exactly what happened in (57): the original *what ho* is used simply as a greeting (as showcased by the response of Stiffy), while the translated exclamation focuses on the reception of new information. It is true, that *jaha, kas* could be understood to be a greeting, but it's definitely much more disinterested than a hearty *what ho*. In this particular context, however, there's no reason to regard it as something more than an acknowledgement of someone entering into the interlocutor's presence.

The same kind of phenomenon can be witnessed in the following example:

(58) We climbed down, and I came forward with outstretched hand, anxious to get the reunion going.

'**What ho**, Stinker.'

'Hullo, Bertie.' (The Code of the Woosters, p. 172)

Kipusimme alas ja astuin esiin kättäni ojentaen innokkaana aloittamaan jälleennäkemisen.

- **Kas**, mitä Pimeä?
- Terve, Bertie. (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 177)

At this point, a skeptical reader might enquire: “But isn’t there a cognitive element present in greetings as well?” The reply to such a query would be yes, but it depends on the context. If one takes a look at the example above, it is clear that Bertie has already acknowledged the presence of Stinker in the narrative sentence. Therefore, it would be redundant to expect that *what ho* in itself would have a cognitive element to it.

But the addition of cognitive flavour isn’t the only thing that can be detected in the translations:

- (59) ‘Got it! **What ho!** The principle of displacement!’ (The Code of the Woosters, p. 214)

“Nyt keksin! **Piru vie!** Upoaman periaate!” (Hiiop, Jeeves, p. 220)

In the example (10), it was established that *what ho* is an expressive exclamation in this context, having both cognitive and emotive qualities. However, this doesn’t seem to be the case with *piru vie*, which, by the looks of it, only seems to convey the emotions of the interlocutor. For once, the cognitive element has actually been obliterated. This kind of trend wasn’t all that prevalent, especially since the translation in itself was rather unique, being usually reserved for *dash it*. While such a detour could be regarded to make a dent in the consistency of the translator’s approach, it’s also a good example on how the context can truly alter the translation strategy of an exclamation.

In the next example, the question of cognitive elements is swept aside – here the focus lies in expressiveness:

- (60) ‘**What-ho**, Bertie,’ he said. ‘**What-ho, what-ho, what-ho**, and again **what-ho**. What a beautiful world this is, Bertie. One of the nicest I ever met.’ (Right Ho, Jeeves, p. 187)

– **Hih-hei**, Bertie, hän sanoi. – **Hih-hei, hih-hei, hih-hei** ja vielä kerran **hih-hei**. Niin kaunis on maa. Parhaita mitä olen koskaan tavannut. (Kiitos, Jeeves, p. 187)

What ho is once again used as a normal greeting here (even though it's employed quite liberally), so there's necessarily no expressiveness in it. And while *hei* is clearly a phatic exclamation, the *hih* prefix alters it to a certain extent.

Expressiveness is added into the expression, and it's not exactly clear-cut whether the phatic component disappears or remains in its place. In fact, the only thing that seems to bespeak the phaticness of the exclamation is how it is conjoined with the address *Bertie*. One is somewhat inclined to consider the translation simply as an expressive exclamation by virtue of the equivocality of the context: it isn't made perfectly clear that the interlocutor is actually greeting Bertie.

However, if that seemed slightly unfair to some, here's another example wherein the situation is much more definite:

- (61) I was about to mount the stairs when a sudden '**What ho!**' from my rear caused me to turn. Tuppy was standing in the hall. He had apparently been down to the cellar for reinforcements, for there were a couple of bottles under his arm. (Right Ho, Jeeves, p. 285)

Olin juuri nousemassa portaita kun selkäni takaa kajahtanut "**Hoijaa!**" sai minut kääntymään. Tuppy seisoj ovella. Hän oli nähtävästi käynyt kellarissa hakemassa lisää vahvistusta, sillä hänellä oli kainalossaan pari pulloa. (Kiitos, Jeeves, p. 284)

Here the translation is without a question un-phatic. By the time the reader of the source text reaches this particular page, it should be fairly clear to them that *what ho* is indeed a greeting, which helps them to construe this specimen as such too. But *hoijaa*, on the other hand, has not been used before in the text. In fact, it's more of a sign of boredom in Finnish. However, here it could be regarded as an expressive shout, perhaps even a conative, if the aim of it was to attract attention. To sum it up, a phatic exclamation was turned into an expressive / conative exclamation in the translation.

All in all, it could be said that there weren't many major functional changes in the translated exclamations. Most of those had to do with metalinguistic or referential matters, while the majority of the changes themselves happened in the micro-level, bringing about evaluative and expressive alterations. Some of those minor changes could be still pretty significant, as was the case with the examples (47), (54), and

(59). This proves that even though the function of the interjection doesn't always change even though the translation was somewhat liberal, a translator shouldn't get too complacent when dealing with these little linguistic items. Such slips may confuse the reader at worst.

5 “‘You see the posish, Jeeves,’ I concluded.”⁵ - The Conclusions

It is time for the climactic chapter of the thesis, wherein I shall come up with an adequate reply to the research question posed at the beginning of this paper. First of all, to answer the question: “How the Wodehousian interjections have been translated in the target texts?” The translator has implemented three different strategies above everything else: literal translation, translation by using an interjection with dissimilar form but the same meaning, and translation by using an interjection with a different meaning. Over 75% of the studied exclamations were translated using these three strategies. Omission, non-interjectional equivalents and additions were also employed, but to a much lesser extent. Furthermore, there seems to be great variety in the equivalents chosen for the original exclamations. This is indicative of the fact, that the translator has approached the interjections from the point of view of their purpose in the text, rather than their semantic meaning or versatility.

The second question was: “What kind of implications do the translation strategies bring about?” In terms of interjectional categories, over half of the eligible, translated exclamations underwent a categorial change. In practice, this means that their form was altered in relation to the original exclamations. And if one approaches the question from a functional angle, a quarter of the applicable exclamations were changed in terms of function. In other words, 1/4 of those exclamations expressed different things than their original counterparts. But as it was noted earlier in the analysis chapter, the majority of the functional changes took place on the micro-level, so the functional category in itself didn’t always change. It is also worth mentioning that in spite of the above-mentioned implications, the translator’s approach was more or less consistent. Once again, it seems that the purpose of the interjections overrode the formal side of things.

The methods employed in this thesis proved to be mostly applicable – clearly Cuenca’s model is suitable for the research of literary translation as well. But the methods were not without their demerits. To name a couple: When dealing with more idiosyncratic interjections like those used by Wodehouse, the question of what serves as a literal translation will ineluctable arise. Should such a thing be established provisionally, or is there a consistent approach it? The matter of categorial divisions

⁵ Quote from *Stiff Upper Lip, Jeeves* by P.G. Wodehouse (1963 / 2008).

also proved to be rather problematic at some points, when trying to figure out which exclamations could be regarded as primary. The author of this thesis would like to call for a more unified definition for the interjectional categories especially.

Naturally, a consensus in the whole matter of interjections would be rather convenient, too.

I'd hope this thesis would encourage other researchers to embark upon closer examination of the translation of interjections from different points of view, and not just in audiovisual translation, but in all kinds of genres. The approach implemented in this thesis has proven to be effective, but it would be even more fascinating to incorporate some methods which would shed light on the rationale of the translatorial strategies, like interviewing the translator. This would create more awareness towards interjections and how different translators view them.

Finally, if all else comes to grief, the author of this thesis would like to make a final plea: Researchers, make use of the splendid corpus that is the oeuvre of Sir Pelham Grenville Wodehouse. This research has barely scratched the surface of something, that is a potential cornucopia of academic research material.

6 Bibliography

Primary sources

Wodehouse, P. G. 2000 (1934). *Right Ho, Jeeves*. Everyman's Library, London.

Wodehouse, P. G. 2008 (1938). *The Code of the Woosters*. Arrow Books, London.

Wodehouse, P. G. 2011 (1946). *Joy in the Morning*. W.W. Norton & Company Inc., New York.

Wodehouse, P. G. 2009. *Kiitos, Jeeves*. Translated by Kaisa Sivenius. Teos, Helsinki.

Wodehouse, P. G. 2010. *Hiiop, Jeeves*. 2nd edition. Translated by Kaisa Sivenius. Teos, Helsinki.

Secondary sources

Aijmer, K. & Rühlemann C. (eds) 2014. *Corpus Pragmatics: A Handbook*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Ameka, F. 1992b. *Interjections: The Universal Yet Neglected Part of Speech*. Journal of Pragmatics 18: 101–108.

Baker, M. 1992. *In Other Words. A Coursebook on Translation*. Routledge, London & New York.

Coulmas, F. (ed.) 1981. *Conversational routine*. The Hague, Mouton.

Cruz, M. P. 2009. *Might Interjections Encode Concepts? More Questions than Answers*. Lodz Papers in Pragmatics: 241–270.

Cuenca, M. 2000. *Defining the Indefinable? Interjections*. Syntaxis 3: 29–44.

Cuenca, M. 2006. *Interjections and Pragmatics Errors in Dubbing*. *Meta*, 51(1): 20–35.

Givón, T. 1993. *English Grammar: A Function-based Introduction*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam & Philadelphia.

Hall Jr., R. 1974. *The Comic Style of P.G. Wodehouse*. The Shoe String Press Inc., Hamden, Connecticut.

Jespersen, O. 1924. *The Philosophy of Grammar*. Allen and Unwin, London.

Matamala, A. 2009. *Interjections in Original and Dubbed Sitcoms in Catalan: A Comparison*. *Meta*, 54(3): 485–502.

Prasad, H. R. 2004. *Laughing with the Master: In Praise of P.G. Wodehouse*. AuthorHouse, Bloomington, India.

Shahraki, A., Karimnia, A., & Mashhady, H. 2012. *A Skopos-Based Study on Translation of Interjections from English into Persian in Drama*. *Elixir Ling. & Trans.* 47 (2012): 9088–9093.

Siironen, K. 2000. *"Don't tell me you got into the wrong room" - Elements of Farce in P.G. Wodehouse's Jeeves & Wooster Novels*. Master's Thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of English. Referred: 8.3.2018. <http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:ju-2000858485>

Stille, P. 2012. *P.G. Wodehouse in Translation to Japanese*. Bachelor's Thesis. Lund University, Centre for Languages and Literature. Referred: 8.3.2018. <http://lup.lub.lu.se/student-papers/record/2968071>

Taavitsainen, I., Kytö, M., Claridge, C. & Smith, J. (eds) 2014. *Developments in English: Expanding Electronic Evidence*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Usborne, R. 1961. *Wodehouse at Work*. Herbert Jenkins, London.

VISK = Hakulinen, A., Vilkuna, M., Korhonen, R., Koivisto, V., Heinonen T. & Alho, I. 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki.

Online version. Referred: 22.3.2018. <http://scripta.kotus.fi/visk> URN:ISBN:978-952-5446-35-7.

Vuotari-Filenius, A. 2001. *Observations on the Quality of Two Finnish Translations of P.G. Wodehouse's A Damsel in Distress*. Master's Thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of English. Referred: 8.3.2018. <http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:jyu-2001872578>.

Wharton, T. 2003. *Interjections, Language, and the 'Showing/Saying' Continuum*. *Pragmatics & Cognition*, Volume 11, Issue 1: 39–91.

Wharton, T. 2009. *Pragmatics and Non-Verbal Communication*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Wierzbicka, A. 1992. *The Semantics of Interjection*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18: 159–192.

Wierzbicka, A. 2003. *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin & New York.

Wilkins, D. 1992. *Interjections as Deictics*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18, Issues 2–3: 119–158.

Wilkins, D. 1995. *Expanding the Traditional Category of Deictic Elements*. In Duchan, J., Bruder G. & Hewitt L. (eds.) *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective*: 359–386. Lawrence Erlbaum, New Jersey.

7 Lyhennelmä

Helsingin yliopisto

Humanistinen tiedekunta

Englannin kääntäminen

Ville Toivonen: *Wodehousemaisten interjektioiden kääntäminen. Kaisa Siveniuksen kolmen Wodehouse-suomennoksen tarkastelu.*

Pro gradu -tutkielma, 60 s., suomenkielinen lyhennelmä 14 s.

Maaliskuu 2018

1 Johdanto

Tässä pro gradu -tutkielmassa paneudun interjektioihin ja siihen, millaisia seurauksia niiden käännöksillä saattaa olla teksteissä. Tutkimusaiheena interjektiot on mitä otollisin, sillä esim. Amekan mukaan (1992a: 101) niitä ei ole juurikaan lingvistisessä diskurssissa tutkittu, eikä niille ole edes vakiintunutta määritelmää. Jo se on epäselvää, mitä ylipäätään nimittää interjektioiksi. Lisäksi on vaikeaa sanoa, mihin luokkaan interjektiot tulisi lokeroita tai miten niiden eri esiintymisinstansseja tulisi luokitella.

Myös Wodehousen tutkiminen on jäänyt hyvin vähälle akateemisissa piireissä. Hall Jr. (1974: 4) valitteli aikanaan tarkempien analyysien puutetta, vaikka Wodehousen tyyllistä nerokkuutta onkin kehuu kovin. Tuoreimmista tutkijoista esimerkiksi Vuotari-Filenius (2001: 6) on tuonut esille Wodehousen kääntämisen tutkimuksen vähäisyyden eritoten suomeen päin käännettäessä. Kuitenkin Wodehousen tyyliä ovat kehuneet jo hänen aikalaisena (Usbourne: 1976: 14), ja kun tätä tutkielmaa lukee pidemmälle, käy varsin selväksi, että nimenomaan interjektiot nousevat Wodehousen tyyliin melko tärkeään asemaan.

Kahden näinkin vähän tutkitun aihealueen yhteen liittäminen on varsin mielekäs pohja tutkimukselle, mutta vielä mielenkiintoisempaa on tuoda mukaan kääntämisen näkökulma, jolloin aiheen tuoreus korostuu entisestään. Näin ollen tutkimuskysymykseni kuuluu seuraavasti: **miten wodehousemaisista interjektioista**

on käännetty kohdeteksteissä, ja millaisia seurauksia käännostrategioiden valinnalla on? Kysymyksen “miten” viittaa käännostrategioiden valintaan sekä vastineiden käyttöön. Seurauksien osalta keskityn interjektioiden kategorioihin ja funktioihin, joista on luvassa lisäinformaatiota tuonempana.

Jotta tutkimuskysymykseen voitaisiin vastata, on ensin otettava selvää, mitä interjektiot oikeastaan ovatkaan. Tämä tapahtuu teoriaosuudessa, jossa koostan tutkielmaa varten tehdyn määritelmän interjektioista käyttäen monia eri lähteitä hyväkseni. Lisäksi pureudun tarkemmin interjektioiden kategorioihin sekä siihen, minkälaisia asioita niillä voidaan ilmaista. Teoriaosuus päättyy pienellä katsauksella Wodehousen tyyliin, sillä on erityisen tärkeää tietää wodehousemaisuuuden erityispiirteet interjektioihin nähden.

Tämän jälkeen käsittelen lyhyesti tutkimuksen tutkimusmenetelmät ja materiaalin. Jo nyt voin kuitenkin sanoa, että primäärilähteinäni käytän kolmea Wodehousen teosta, jotka kuuluvat kaikki samaan Jeeves-sarjaan: *Right Ho, Jeeves* (1934), *The Code of the Woosters* (1938) ja *Joy in the Morning* (1946). Käännösvertailussa käytän Kaisa Siveniuksen kynästä luotuja suomennoksia, jotka on julkaistu *Kiitos, Jeeves* (2009) ja *Hiiop, Jeeves* (2010) -kokoelmateoksissa.

Neljäs kappale on varattu itse analyysille, ja loppuhuipentuma tapahtuu viidennen kappaleen päätelmissä.

2 Teoria

Tässä kappaleessa tarkastellaan, mitä interjektiot ovat ja mitä kaikkea niillä voidaan ilmaista. Lähestyn aihetta sekä kieli- että käännoستieteen näkökulmasta, mutta avaan myös kahta pääjakotapaa, joilla interjektioita voidaan luokitella. Kaikki määritelmät ja luokittelut tullaan koostamaan eri lähteistä konsensuksen puuttuessa. Analyysin pohjana tullaan käyttämään Cuencan (2006) kuusipolvista käännosmallia, josta tullaan myös kuulemaan sananen. Wodehousesta puhuttaessa vetoan sekä vanhempiin Wodehouse-konkareihin, kuten Hall Jr.:n (1974) ja Usbourneen (1976), sekä vähän uudempiin tulokkaisiin, kuten Stilleen (2012).

2.1 Interjektiot

Ison suomen kieliopin verkkoversion (VISK) mukaan interjektiot ovat “vakiintuneita kielellisen toiminnan yksiköitä, rituaalistuneita keinoja osoittaa affekteja johonkin odottamattomaan tapahtumaan tai asioiden käänteeseen – vaikka läsnä ei olisi kuulijoitakaan.” (VISK § 856.) Pykälässä interjektioille tarjotaan esimerkeiksi seuraavia: *aah, huhhuh, höh, loiskis* ja *voi perkele kuitenkin*. Givón (1993: 81-82) on samoilla linjoilla, mutta tuo esille lisäksi sosiaalisen kanssakäymisen näkökulman. Wilkins (1992: 120) korostaa omalla tahollaan interjektioden semanttista monivivahteisuutta ja konseptuaalista rakennetta, jolloinka ne ovat hänen mukaansa selvästi kielen elementtejä.

Wharton (2003: 174) on kuitenkin sitä mieltä, että interjektiot eivät ole kielellisiä elementtejä, sillä niitä analysoidaan hänen mukaansa ennemminkin sosiaalisen kanssakäymisen pohjalta kuin kielellisen sisältönsä vuoksi. VISK:n määritelmässä kuitenkin otettiin huomioon kuulijoiden läsnäolevuuden tarpeettomuus, ja lisäksi esim. Cuenca (2000: 31) painottavat interjektioden vaihtelevuutta kielestä toiseen – eli että ne kuuluvat olennaisesti kielen piiriin.

Näin ollen interjektiot ovat tässä tutkielmassa kielen elementtejä. Niille tarvitaan kuitenkin tarkempi luokittelu, jos havitellaan kattavaa määrittelyä. Cuenca (2000: 30) pyrkiikin tällaiseen prototyyppianalyysin kautta, ja nimeää neljä eri hypoteesia, jotka vääräksi todistamalla hän saisi muodostetuksi tarkemman määritelmän.

Hypoteeseissa nostetaan esille (1) interjektioden epäkielellisyys / -kielioppisuus, (2) niiden liiallinen samankaltaisuus muiden kieliluokkien kanssa (kuten adverbien ja partikkelien), (3) niiden lausemaisuus sekä se, että (4) interjektiot koostavat oman kieliopillisen luokkansa. (1) on jo todistettu kyseenalaiseksi, ja (2) adverbilla sun muilla ei Cuencan (2000: 31) mukaan ole itsekään mitään määritteleviä ominaispiirteitä; eivätkä interjektiot edes käyttäydy samalla tavalla. (3) on sikäli Cuencan (2000: 32) mukaan totta, sillä interjektiot käyttäytyvät samalla tavalla, mutta niissä ei ole subjektia tai predikaattia. Lopulta todettuaan, että (4) ei pidä paikkaansa kriteerien epäsopivuuden vuoksi, Cuenca päätyy loppupäätelmään, että interjektiot ovat periferaalinen lauseluokka. Tätä määritelmää käytetään myös tässä tutkielmassa.

Tähän on vielä hyvä lisätä, että Wilkinsin (1992: 153) mielestä interjektiot voivat morfologisesti sekä syntaktisesti muodostaa tarpeeksi eheän luokan, mikä tukee

Cuencan luokittelua. Cuenca (2000: 42) huomauttaa vielä lopuksi, että subjektiivisuus tulee olemaan keskiössä interjektioiden analyysissä. Kyseessä on erityisen tärkeä huomio, kun tulen rajaamaan tutkielman aineistoa.

Ennen kuin etenen seuraavaan osioon, haluan tuoda esille Amekan (1992a: 103) terminologisen huomion: Interjektioista puhuttaessa olisi hyvä keskittyä itse luokkaan, kun taas lausetason elementeistä puhuttaessa käytettäisiin termiä huudahdus (*exclamation*). Tulen seuraamaan tätä ohjenuoraa tästedes.

2.1.1 Primaariset, sekundaariset ja kompleksiset interjektiot

Otsikon jako perustuu Amekan (1992a: 105) esittämään perusjakoon. **Primaarisilla** Ameka tarkoittaa niitä interjektioita, joita ei muulla tavalla käytetä. Mahdollisia suomenkielisiä esimerkkejä voisivat olla *au* ja *hyi*. **Sekundaariset** interjektiot ovat Amekalle (1992a: 105) niitä, jotka semanttisesti voidaan luokitella muihin kielipillisiin luokkiin, mutta jotka voivat esiintyä itsenäisesti yksisanaisina äänteinä. Suomalaisina esimerkkeinä voisivat olla *piru* ja *kauhistus*. (Fraasien käyttöön (kuten *pyhä jysäys*) Ameka (1992a: 111) ei kuitenkaan kehota, mutta tämä kehoitus perustuu valitettavasti siihen olettamukseen, että interjektiot olisivat sanaluokka eivätkä lauseenkaltainen luokka. Täten tämä ehdotus hylätään, ja fraasit otetaan mukaan sekundaarisiin interjektioihin.) **Kompleksiset** interjektiot ovat ne huudahdukset, joissa useat morfeemit muodostavat yhtenäisen fonologisen kokonaisuuden (Ameka 1992a: 111). Suomen kielessä näitä ovat esim. *heissulivei* ja *hittolainen*.

Tässä luokittelussa on kuitenkin puutteita. Aijmer & Rühlemann (2014: 255) huomauttavat, että jotkut sanat voivat tulla kieleen ensin jonain muina elementteinä, kuin interjektioina (esim. englannin *wow*) ja että etymologisesti ajateltuna monet primaariset interjektiot olisivatkin tämän luokittelun mukaan sekundaarisia. Kyseessä on hyvä pointti, ja se otetaan huomioon tässä tutkielmassa seuraavasti: jos *Oxford Dictionariesin* mukaan sanalla on muita kuin ei-interjektionaalisia määritelmiä, kyseessä on sekundaari interjektio.

2.1.2 Interjektioiden luokittelu funktion perusteella

Ameka (1992a: 113) jakaa interjektiot kolmeen eri funktiolliseen kategoriaan: **ekspressiivisiin**, **konatiivisiin** ja **faattisiin**. Ekspressiivisillä interjektioilla ilmaistaan puhujan psyykkistä olotilaa, ja ne voidaan jakaa tarkemmin **emotiivisiin** ja **kognitiivisiin** osioihin. Näistä ensimmäinen viittaa tunnetiloihin ja tuntemuksiin, kun taas jälkimmäinen keskittyy tiedostamiseen. (ibid.) Suomen kielessä esimerkiksi *yäk* luetaan emotiiviseksi ja *ahaa* kognitiiviseksi.

Konatiivisilla Ameka (ibid.) tarkoittaa interjektioita, jotka osoitetaan jollekin kuulijalle ja jolla pyritään samaan aikaan tietty reaktio tai teko, esimerkiksi *shh*. Faattiset puolestaan pitävät keskustelua yllä esimerkiksi palautereagoinnin keinoin (Ameka 1992a: 114), kuten *jep* tai *mhm* tekevät. Samalla faattiset interjektiot viestivät puhujan asennoitumisesta keskustelua kohtaan.

Wierzbicka (2003) on pitkälti samoilla linjoilla omissa luokitteluissaan, joskin hän nimittää konatiivisuutta volatiivisuudeksi. Itse tulen käyttämään tutkielmassani Amekan termiä, mutta tulen käyttämään Wierzbickan parafrasimenetelmää, jonka avulla hän määrittelee interjektioden funktion. Esimerkiksi *shh* olisi tämän menetelmän mukaan sanottavissa näin: “Ole hiljaa.”

Näiden määritelmien lisäksi Cuenca (2000: 37-38) tuo mukaan vielä kaksi ylimääräistä luokkaa: **referentiaaliset** ja **metalingvistiset** interjektiot. Referentiaalisilla hän viittaa onomatopoeettisiin ilmaisuihin, ja metalingvistikilla hän tarkoittaa interjektioita, jotka vastaavat diskurssipartikkeleita. Matamala (2009: 488) tarkentaa metalingvistikyyttä siten, että moiset interjektiot rajaavat keskusteluvuoroja. Suomeksi esimerkkeinä toimivat esim. *kuule* tai *noh*.

Yllä mainitut funktioluokat käsittävät tutkielmani pääkategoriat funktioiden suhteen, mutta tuon mukaan myös kolme uutta mikrotason luokkaa. Nämä ovat Givónin (1993: 81-82) mukaan **episteemiset**, **deontiset** ja **evaluatiiviset** interjektio-
luokat.

Seuraavat määritelmät ovat Givónin, mutta esimerkit ovat omiani. Episteemiset interjektiot ottavat kantaa vastaanotetun tiedon oikeellisuuteen (esim. *pötyä*), deontiset siihen, miten puhuja hyväksyy keskustelukumppanin teot (esim. *nyt loppu*) ja evaluatiiviset siihen, mitkä ovat puhujan mieltymykset tekojen tai asiantilojen suhteen (esim. *eikä*).

Ennen kuin siirryn käsittelemään interjektioiden kääntämistä, on hyvä huomauttaa, että tässä analyysissä interjektioille voidaan antaa monta eri pääfunktiokategoriata. Sen sijaan siihen ei oteta kantaa, mikä funktioista on se kaikkein päällimmäisin. Lisäksi luokittelussa otetaan huomioon kaikki mahdolliset funktiot, joita lähtötekstissä ilmeni. Käytännössä tämä tarkoittaa sitä, että luokittelut ovat yleisiä, eivätkä päde joka ikisessä huudahduksen instanssissa (esim. jossain kohtaa huudahdus voi olla faattinen, kun taas toisessa kohtaa se voikin olla pelkästään metalingvistinen).

2.1.3 Interjektioiden kääntäminen

Koska interjektioiden kääntämistä ei olla käsitelty kovinkaan paljoa, eikä sen suhteen ole tietääkseni esitetty muita malleja kuin Cuencan (2006) kuusipolvinen käännösmalli, tulen pohjustamaan tämän osion ainoastaan Cuencan teorialle. Hän luettelee kuusi eri käännösstrategiaa interjektioille, jotka ovat kyllä audiovisuaaliseen kääntämiseen tarkoitettut, mutta joissa ei ole näennäisesti mitään audiovisuaalisen kääntämisen erityispiirteitä. Näin ollen malli sopii mainiosti tutkimukseeni.

Strategiat ovat a) kirjaimellinen käännös, b) erimuotoisen mutta samamerkityksisen interjektion käyttö, c) samamerkityksisen ilmaisun käyttö, joka ei ole interjektio, d) erimerkityksisen interjektion käyttö, e) poisjättö ja f) elementtien lisäys. (Cuenca 2006: 27-28.) Mallin ovat testanneet ja hyväksi todenneet ainakin Thawabteh (2010) ja Shahraki ym. (2012). Koska kyseiset strategiat ovat hyvin kontekstiriippuvaisia, selitän itse analyysivaiheessa tarkemmin strategioista, jos siihen on tarve.

2.2 Wodehousen tyyli interjektioiden näkökulmasta

Tutkielman kaikki kolme alkuperäistekstiä ovat samaa Jeeves-sarjaa. Tämän sarjan minä-kertojana toimii Bertie Wooster (Usborne 1961: 152), joten näin ollen on perusteltua tutkia hänen kielenkäyttöään. Hall Jr.:n (1974: 94) mukaan Bertielle tyypillisiä hyvästelyilmaisuja ovat *bung-oh*, *teuf-teuf*, *tinkerty-tonk*, *pip-pip*, ja *toodle-oo*, ja Stille (2012) nimeää muutaman jo mainitun lisäksi seuraavat: *right ho*, *by Jove*, *dash it* ja *what ho*. *Oxford Dictionariesin* mukaan *right ho* on vanhahtava huudahdus, jolla ilmaistaan suostumusta tai hyväksyntää; *by Jove* on vanhahtava huudahdus, jolla korostetaan jotain tai ilmaistaan ällistystä ja *dash it*illä ilmaistaan pientä suuttumusta. Yllä olevat ilmaukset tulevat siis olemaan niitä, joita tutkielman analyysivaiheessa käytetään. Pieniä kirjoitusasumuutoksia ei tulla ottamaan erikseen

huomioon aineistoa määritellessä: jos esimerkiksi *right ho* on kirjoitettu *right-ho*, kyseessä on ihan yhtä käypä huudahdus.

Wodehousen tyylistä puhuttaessa Hall Jr. (1974: 80) mainitsee myös kirjailijan taipumuksen käyttää tietoisien arkaaisia sanavalintoja. Myös epämuodollisten ilmaisujen käyttö on nostettu Hall Jr.:n kirjassa esille (1974: 69). Näin ollen tutkielman analyysiaineistona käytetään myös niitä lähtötekstissä käytettyjä huudahduksia, jotka on *Oxford Dictionaries*issa määritelty arkaaisiksi (archaic) tai epämuodollisiksi (informal).

3 Materiaali ja tutkimusmenetelmä

Tutkimukseen valittiin kolme Wodehousen kirjaa: *Right Ho, Jeeves* (1934), *The Code of the Woosters* (1938) ja *Joy in the Morning* (1946). Valinta tapahtui viidestä syystä: 1. Kirjat ovat kaikki samaa Jeeves-sarjaa ja saman henkilön kertojan omaavia, ja näin ollen niiden tyyli on varsin samanlainen. 2. Kirjat ovat peräkkäisiä julkaisuja Jeeves-sarjassa ja vieläpä suhteellisen lyhyellä aikavälillä julkaistuja. 3. Kolmen kokonaisen kirjan sisällyttäminen korostaa analysoitavien interjektioiden wodehousemaisuuksia eli niiden tyypillisyyttä kirjailijan tyylille. 4. Jokainen kirja tuo jonkin uuden huudahduksen mukaan tutkimukseen. 5. Kahdesta viimeisestä julkaisusta ei ole minun käsitykseni mukaan tehty aikaisemmin käännöstutkimusta. *Right Ho, Jeeves*in sisällyttäminen on kuitenkin varsin mielekästä, sillä jopa kirjan nimessä on yksi wodehousemainen huudahdus.

Käännökset on tehnyt Kaisa Sivenius, ja ne on julkaistu kahdessa kokoelmateoksessa: *Kiitos, Jeeves* (2009), joka sisältää *Right Ho, Jeeves*in ja *Hiiop, Jeeves* (2010), jossa ovat loput kaksi teosta. Kääntäjä ja hänen teoksensa valittiin lähinnä niiden saatavuuden vuoksi, mutta myös siksi, että teokset on käännetty hyvin lyhyellä aikavälillä. Koska kirjat ovat samaa sarjaa, on oletettavaa, että kääntäjä ei muuttanut käännösstrategioitaan tai tyyliään silmiinpistävästi urakan aikana.

Poimin tutkittavat huudahdukset teorialuvussa asettamani kriteerien pohjalta lähtötekstistä, ja tämän jälkeen etsin niiden vastineet käännöksistä. Analyysiosiossa luokittelen kyseiset huudahdukset niiden tyyppikategorian (primaarinen, sekundaarinen, kompleksinen) ja funktioiden mukaan sekä sen mukaan, mitä Cuencan strategiaa kunkin huudahdusinstanssin kohdalla on käytetty. Tämän jälkeen

analysoin, miten huudahduksia on teksteissä käännetty, kuinka johdonmukainen kääntäjä on ollut valinnoissaan ja millaisia seurauksia tyyppikategorioiden ja funktioiden osalta käännöksillä on itse tekstissä. Näin ollen analyysi on sekä kvantitatiivista että kvalitatiivista, mutta käännöksen “hyvyyteen” tai “huonouteen” ei tulla ottamaan kantaa.

4 Analyysi

Tässä luvussa käyn ensin läpi lyhyesti, mitkä huudahdukset ovat tutkimuksen kohteena ja miksi. Tämän jälkeen luokittelen ne tyyppikategorioiden ja funktioiden perusteella. Toiseksi tarkastelen, miten huudahduksia on käännetty ja millaisia seurauksia käännöksillä on tyyppikategorioiden ja funktioiden osalta.

4.1 Lähtötekstien huudahdukset

Lähtöteksteistä löytyi yhteensä 172 käypää huudahdusta. Nämä käsittivät seuraavat, tutkijoiden nimeämät ilmaisut: *bung-ho*, *by Jove*, *dash it*, *ho*, *pip-pip*, *right-ho*, *tinkerty-tonk*, *toodle-oo* ja *what ho*. *Ho* sisällytettiin siksi, että se on olennainen osa monia wodehousemaisia huudahduksia. Arkaaisia ilmaisuja löytyi yksi, *egad* (ilmaisee *Oxford Dictionariesin* mukaan yllätyneisyyttä, vihaa tai jonkun asian vahvistusta), ja epämuodollisia huudahduksia löytyi kaksi, *coo* ja *golly* (jotka ilmaisevat saman lähteen mukaan yllätyneisyyttä).

Primaarisiin interjektioihin lukeutui kaksi huudahdusta: *egad* ja *toodle-oo*.

Sekundaarisiin saatiin vähän enemmän tavaraa: *by Jove*, *coo*, *dash it*, *golly*, *ho*, *right ho* ja *what ho*. Kaikki loput, eli *bung-ho*, *pip-pip* ja *tinkerty-tonk*, luokitellaan kompleksisiksi interjektioiksi.

Käsittelen nyt huudahdukset funktioiden osalta aakkosjärjestyksessä. Ensimmäisenä vuorossa on *bung-ho*, jonka yhdessä ainoassa instanssissa löytyi sekä faattisia että ekspressiivisiä piirteitä. *By Jove* on ilmeisen ekspressiivisyytensä lisäksi myös faattinen, sillä sitä käytettiin muutamaan otteeseen ylimääräisenä täyteilmaisuna, jonka tarkoitus on lähinnä pitää yllä keskustelua. *Coo* jatkaa ekspressiivistä linjaa, mutta tuo mukaan myös konatiivisuutta muutamaan otteeseen; ilmaisulla selkeästi haluttiin tiettyjä reaktioita.

Dash it on myös selkeästi ekspressiivinen, mutta se jakoi myös metalingvistisesti keskusteluvuoroja. *Egad* ja *golly* ovat sekä ekspressiivisiä että faattisia molemmat, ja pystyvät lisäksi ilmaisemaan asioita sekä episteemisesti, deonttisesti että evaluatiivisesti. *Ho* on *coon* tavoin ekspressiiviskonatiivinen.

Pip-pip on ensimmäinen huudahdus, joka voidaan luokitella referentiaaliseksi sen onomatopoeettisuuden vuoksi. Koska kyseessä on myös hyvästelyhuudahdus, on se myös luokiteltavissa faattiseksi. *Right ho* sen sijaan lukeutuu kohdasta riippuen jopa kolmeen eri luokkaan: ekspressiiviseen, metalingvistiseen ja faattiseen.

Tinkerty-tonk olisi muuten pelkästään faattinen ilmaisu, mutta kirjassa sitä käytettiin kerran myös ilmaisemaan tiettyä ekspressiivisyyttä; *toodle-oo* on sen sijaan pelkästään faattinen. Listan viimeinen huudahdus, *what ho*, oli *right hon* tavoin luokiteltavissa peräti kolmeen luokkaan: ekspressiiviseen, metalingvistiseen ja faattiseen.

Kokosin havainnot seuraavaan taulukkoon:

Huudahdus	Interjektiotyyppi	Funktio	Instanssit
Bung-ho	Kompleksinen	Ekspressiivinen / Faattinen	1
By Jove	Sekundaarinen	Ekspressiivinen / Faattinen	7
Coo	Sekundaarinen	Ekspressiivinen / Konatiivinen	10
Dash it	Sekundaarinen	Ekspressiivinen / Metalingvistinen	42
Egad	Primaarinen	Ekspressiivinen	10
Golly	Sekundaarinen	Ekspressiivinen	19
Ho	Sekundaarinen	Konatiivinen /	6

		Ekspressiivinen	
Pip-pip	Kompleksinen	Faattinen / Referentiaallinen	5
Right-ho	Sekundaarinen	Ekspressiivinen / Metalingvistinen / Faattinen	40
Tinkerty-tonk	Kompleksinen	Ekspressiivinen / Faattinen	2
Toodle-oo	Primaarinen	Faattinen	4
What ho	Sekundaarinen	Ekspressiivinen / Metalingvistinen / Faattinen	26

Taulukko 1. Huudahdukset.

4.2 Käännösstrategiat

Huudahdusten käännösstrategiajakauma oli seuraava:

A	B	C	D	E	F
Kirjaimelli- nen käännös	Erimuotoi- sen mutta samamerki- tyksisen interjektion käyttö	Samamerki- tyksisen ilmaisun käyttö, joka ei ole interjektio	Erimerki- tyksisen interjektion käyttö	Poisjättö	Elementtien lisäys
49	42	5	40	11	25

Taulukko 2. Huudahdusten käännösinstanssit.

Kirjaimelliseksi käännökseksi laskettiin pääasiallisesti sellainen käännös, jonka muoto, funktio ja merkitys vastasivat alkuperäistä (esim. *dash it*in riittävän kirjaimellinen vastine on *piru vie*). Elementtien lisäksi kelpuutettiin instanssit, joissa jo olemassa oleviin huudahduksiin oli selkeästi lisätty jotain ylimääräistä, esim. *jukupliuta*.

Kuten yllä olevasta taulukosta voi päätellä, strategiat A,B ja D olivat suosituimpia lähestymistapoja kääntäjällä. Suurilta osin kääntäjä siis suosi merkityksen säilyttämistä, mutta poikkeuksiakin löytyi runsaasti.

4.3 Tyypikategoriat ja funktiot

Alla olevaan taulukkoon on koottu kaikki huudahdukset, jotka käännettiin käyttämällä käännostrategioita A, B ja D. Muut strategiat eivät soveltuneet kategorianalyysiin.

Huudahdus	Interjektiotyyppi	Kategorinen muutos	Ei muutosta
Bung-ho	Kompleksinen	-	1
By Jove	Sekundaarinen	-	7
Coo	Sekundaarinen	10	-
Dash it	Sekundaarinen	-	21
Egad	Primaarinen	4	4
Golly	Sekundaarinen	7	7
Ho	Sekundaarinen	-	6
Pip-pip	Kompleksinen	2	-
Right-ho	Sekundaarinen	24	11

Tinkerty-tonk	Kompleksinen	2	-
Toodle-oo	Primaarinen	4	-
What ho	Sekundaarinen	14	6

Taulukko 3. Tyypikategoriat.

Lihavointi tarkoittaa tässä sitä, että kaikki instanssit kyseisestä huudahduksesta ovat taulukossa. Tällaisia tapauksia oli yhteensä kuusi (*bung-ho*, *by Jove*, *coo*, *ho*, *tinkerty-tonk* ja *toodle-oo*), ja jokainen niistä listautui joko muutettujen tai ei-muutettujen marginaaliin. Vaikka esimerkiksi *bung-hon* ja *tinkerty-tonkin* osalta tämä on voinut olla pelkkää sattumaa, esimerkiksi *coo* ja *ho* oli käännetty kautta tekstien samalla tavalla, ja näin ollen niiden kategorillinen muutos oli johdonmukainen.

Yleisesti ottaen nimenomaan johdonmukaisuus paistaa kääntäjän ratkaisuihin, sillä ainoastaan muutaman huudahduksen kohdalla muutosjakauma asettuu tasan tai lähelle sitä. Kuitenkin pelkkää muutosjakaumaa tarkasteltaessa voi huomata, että yli puolet huudahduksista on muuttanut tyyppiään.

Vastineiden puolesta tekstissä esiintyi huimia eroavaisuuksia: esimerkiksi *what hon* kuudessa ei-muutoksellisissa instanssissa ei esiintynyt yhtään samaa vastinetta, ja muutoksellisissa oli havaittavissa jopa kuutta eri varianttia. Sama ilmiö tuntui toistuvan muidenkin, paitsi edellä mainittujen *coon* ja *hon*, kohdalla.

Seuraavassa taulukossa ovat esillä funktiolliset tekijät (lihavointi kuten edellä).

Käännösstrategioiden osalta vain poisjätetyt instanssit jätettiin taulukon ulkopuolelle.

Huudahdus	Funktio	Funktiollinen muutos	Ei muutosta
Bung-ho	Ekspressiivinen / Faattinen	-	1
By Jove	Ekspressiivinen /	-	7

	Faattinen		
Coo	Ekspressiivinen / Konatiivinen	-	10
Dash it	Ekspressiivinen / Metalingvistinen	3	33
Egad	Ekspressiivinen	2	6
Golly	Ekspressiivinen	-	19
Ho	Konatiivinen / Ekspressiivinen	6	-
Pip-pip	Faattinen / Referentiaalinen	5	-
Right-ho	Ekspressiivinen / Metalingvistinen / Faattinen	7	32
Tinkerty-tonk	Ekspressiivinen / Faattinen	1	1
Toodle-oo	Faattinen	-	4
What ho	Ekspressiivinen / Metalingvistinen / Faattinen	16	10

Taulukko 4. Funktiokategoriat.

Kun näitä eri instansseja tarkastelee sekä tilastojen että esimerkkien kautta, käy varsin selväksi, että suurempia pääfunktioillisia muutoksia ei ole tapahtunut käännöksissä. Näiden osalta muutoksia tapahtui lähinnä metalingvistikategorian ja referentiaalisuuden poisjätöissä. Suurin osa muutoksista tapahtuikin mikrotasolla: evaluatiivisuus vaihteli suomennoksissa, kuin myös käännöksen emotiivisuus ja/tai kognitiivisuus.

5 Päätelmät

Tutkimuskysymykseni oli: miten wodehousemaisia interjektioita on käännetty kohdeteksteissä, ja millaisia seurauksia käännöstrategioiden valinnalla on? Analyysin kautta käy selväksi, että kääntäjä on suosinut selkeästi kolmea käännösstrategiaa yli muiden: kirjaimellista käännöstä, erimuotoisen mutta samamerkityksisen interjektion käyttöä sekä erimerkityksisen interjektion käyttöä. Kääntäjä on myös käyttänyt lukuisia eri vastineita lähdetekstien huudahduksille, eikä ole pyrkinyt pitäytymään tietyissä, funktioiltaan kaikenkattavissa vastineissa.

Käännösstrategioiden seuraukset olivat seuraavat: Tyypikategorioiden osalta yli puolet huudahduksista muutti tyyppiään käännöksessä. Funktioiden osalta sen sijaan vähän yli neljäsosa kävi läpi funktionaalisen muutoksen, mutta kuten analyysiosiossa huomattiin, nämä muutokset tapahtuivat kuitenkin lähinnä mikrotasolla. Tästä kaikesta voi päätellä sen, että kääntäjä on pyrkinyt säilyttämään interjektioden tarkoituksen eikä niinkään niiden muodollisia seikkoja.

Tutkielma on myös lisäksi todistanut sen, että Cuencan mallia voidaan käyttää audiovisuaalisen kääntämisen lisäksi kirjallisuuden kääntämisen piirissä. Toivon, että tämä rohkaisisi muita tutkijoita hyödyntämään mallia, sekä tutkimaan enemmän interjektioden mikroskooppista mutta tärkeää maailmaa. Mielenkiintoisen lisän tällaisille tutkimuksille voisivat tuoda kääntäjien omat kommentit ratkaisuilleen.

Toivon myös, että tutkielmani kannustaisi muitakin paneutumaan tarkemmin Wodehousen kirjallisen tuotoksen tutkimiseen. Hänen tuotantonsa kun tarjoaa eväitä vaikka millaiselle tutkimukselle.